NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. DXII.

JULY, 1899.

A CHANNEL PASSAGE.

1855.

BY ALGERNON CHARLES SWINBURNE.

Forth from Calais, at dawn of night, when sunset summer on autumn shone,
Fared the steamer, alert and loud, through seas whence only the sun was gone:
Soft and sweet as the sky they smiled, and bade man welcome: a dim, sweet hour
Gleamed and whispered in wind and sea, and heaven was fair as a field in flower.
Stars fulfilled the desire of the darkling world, as with music: the starbright air
Made the face of the sea, if aught may make the face of the sea, more fair.

Whence came change? Was the sweet night weary of rest? What anguish awoke in the dark?
Sudden, sublime, the strong storm spake: we heard the thunders as hounds that bark.
Lovelier, if aught may be lovelier, than stars, we saw the lightnings exalt the sky,

Copyright, 1899, by The North American Review Publishing Company. All rights reserved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Living and lustrous and rapturous as love that is born but to
quicken and lighten and die.
Heaven's own heart, at its highest of delight, found utterance in
music and semblance in fire:
Thunder on thunder exulted, rejoicing to live and to satiate the
night's desire.

And the night was alive and anhungered of life, as a tiger from
toils cast free:
And a rapture of rage made joyous the spirit and strength of the
soul of the sea.
All the weight of the wind bore down on it, freighted with death
for fraught:
And the keen waves kindled and quickened, as things transfigured
or things distraught.
And madness fell on them laughing and leaping; and madness
came on the wind:
And the might and the light and the darkness of storm were as
storm in the heart of Ind.

Such glory, such terror, such passion, as lighten and harrow the
far, fierce East,
Rang, shone, spake, shuddered around us: the night was an altar
with death for priest.
The channel that sunders England from shores where never was
man born free
Was clothed with the likeness and thrilled with the strength and
the wrath of a tropic sea.
As a wild steed ramps in rebellion, and rears till it swerves from
a backward fall,
The strong ship struggled and reared, and her deck was upright
as a sheer cliff's wall.

Stern and stem plunged under, alternate: a glimpse, a recoil, a
breath,
And she sprang as the life in a god made man would spring at the
throat of death.
Three glad hours, and it seemed not an hour, of supreme and
supernal joy,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Filled full with delight that revives in remembrance a sea-bird's
heart in a boy.
For the central crest of the night was cloud that thundered and
flamed, sublime
As the splendor and song of the soul everlasting that quickens the
pulse of time.

The glory beholden of man in a vision, the music of light over-
heard,
The rapture and radiance of battle, the life that abides in the fire
of a word,
In the midmost heaven enkindled, was manifest far on the face
of the sea,
And the rage in the roar of the voice of the waters was heard but
when heaven breathed free.
Far eastward, clear of the covering of cloud, the sky laughed out
into light
From the rims of the storm to the sea's dark edge with flames that
were flowerlike and white.

The leaping and luminous blossoms of live sheet lightning that
laugh as they fade
From the cloud's black base to the black wave's brim rejoiced in
the light they made.
Far westward, throned in a silent sky, where life was in lustrous
tune,
Shone, sweeter and surer than morning or evening, the steadfast
smile of the moon.
The limitless heaven that enshrined them was lovelier than
dreams may behold, and deep
As life or as death, revealed and transfigured, may shine on the
soul through sleep.

All glories of toil and of triumph and passion and pride that it
yearns to know
Bore witness there to the soul of its likeness and kinship, above
and below.
The joys of the lightnings, the songs of the thunders, the strong
sea's labor and rage,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Were tokens and signs of the war that is life and is joy for the soul to wage.
No thought strikes deeper or higher than the heights and the depths that the night made bare,
Illimitable, infinite, awful and joyful, alive in the summit of air—

Air stilled and thrilled by the tempest that thundered between its reign and the sea's,
Rebellious, rapturous, and transient as faith or as terror that bows men's knees.
No love sees loftier and fairer the form of its godlike vision in dreams
Than the world shone then, when the sky and the sea were as love for a breath's length seems—
One utterly, mingled and mastering and mastered, and laughing with love that subsides
As the glad, mad night sank panting and satiate with storm, and released the tides.

In the dense mid-channel the steam-souled ship hung hovering, assailed and withheld
As a soul born royal, if life or if death be against it, is thwarted and quelled.
As the glories of myriads of glow-worms in lustrous grass on a boundless lawn
Were the glories of flames phosphoric that made of the water a light like dawn.
A thousand Phosphors, a thousand Hespers, awoke in the churning sea,
And the swift, soft hiss of them living and dying was clear as a tune could be;

As a tune that is played by the fingers of death on the keys of life or of sleep,
Audible alway alive in the storm, too fleet for a dream to keep;
Too fleet, too sweet for a dream to recover and thought to remember awake:
Light subtler and swifter than lightning, that whispers and laughs in the live storm's wake,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the wild bright wake of the storm, in the dense loud heart of the laboring hour,
A harvest of stars by the storm's hand reaped, each fair as a star-shaped flower.

And sudden and soft as the passing of sleep is, the passing of tempest seemed,
When the light and the sound of it sank, and the glory was gone as a dream half dreamed.
The glory, the terror, the passion that made of the midnight a miracle, died,
Not slain at a stroke, nor in gradual reluctance abated of power and of pride.
With strong, swift subsidence, awful as power that is wearied of power upon earth,
As a God that were wearied of power upon heaven, and were fain of a new God's birth.

The might of the night subsided: the tyranny kindled in darkness fell:
And the sea and the sky put off them the rapture and radiance of heaven and of hell.
The waters, heaving and hungering at heart, made way, and were well-nigh fain
For the ship that had fought them, and wrestled, and revelled in labor, to cease from her pain.
And an end was made of it: only remembrance endures of the glad loud strife;
And the sense that a rapture so royal may come not again in the passage of life.

ALGERNON C. SWINBURNE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

EX ORIENTE LUX!

A PLEA FOR A RUSSO-AMERICAN UNDERSTANDING.

BY VLADIMIR HOLMSTREM.

WITH AN INTRODUCTION BY PRINCE E. OOKHTOMSKY, EDITOR OF THE "*ST. PETERSBURG VIEDOMOSTI.*"

In 1893, in my book, "The Travels to the Far East of Nicolas II.," I sought to demonstrate the world-wide political significance of the present Tsar's journey through Asia. I thus addressed my countrymen: "We stand on the threshold of an epoch that promises to bring grave complications with it. If, therefore, we realize the absorbing need of a process of moral healing (which is in itself a source of renewed strength), if we would acquire increased knowledge, and if, without regard to our probable sufferings in the process, we mean to do noble deeds" in the name of Russia and the Tsar, "we must face and seriously study the following questions: What were the forces that called us into being, what was the process of the growth of our country, what blood is it that flows in our veins, and, finally, what are the glorious legacies of our past bequeathed to us by days of yore? The dominant factor in the history of Russia's past is the influence of Asia. She crushed us, but she has also regenerated us. In common with her we have created *the idea of autocracy* (which has nothing in common with the Cæsarism of the West); it is an idea that pervades all Asia and is as the breath of life to her."

Thus I spoke in 1893. Now, addressing our friends beyond the two oceans—the Americans—I shall ask: What was the dominant factor in the past of America? Was it not emancipation from and independence of England? The Puritans fled from the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

spiritual and political tyranny of oligarchical England and laid the foundations of a new commonwealth on strictly democratic lines. The war of independence was one for emancipation from English economic and political tyranny, and created new opportunities for the wonderful development of America. Such are the lessons of the past. And now again comes the time for America to emancipate herself from England's political tutelage, veiled, though it be, in the guise of cousinly friendship. The Chinese question, that touchstone of this friendship, has already betrayed the duplicity of the English, and yet America's disappointments are only beginning. She is yet to see what golden egg will be laid for her by that Samoan goose which English journalists have nursed so tenderly with an eye both to Germany and the United States.

Turning to the question of an understanding between America and Russia, based on mutual good will, I hold it as highly desirable, and believe that the support of the independence and integrity of China would afford the best opportunity for the co-operation of Russia and the United States. Yet I will allow myself to ask, as I did in my book six years ago: May not the culture of the West (or an excess of it) with its pronounced individualistic tendencies, leading almost to anarchy, inflict on the Chinese, these Asiatics who have never known the meaning of material progress, nor have ever striven for it, the misery of a civilization out of harmony with their natural inclinations? With this reservation I fully approve of the Rev. Gilbert Reid's scheme of an international institute for China, particularly as he means to give due attention to the characteristic individuality of China, and exhibits much regard for her traditions and racial inclinations, without any idea of converting Asiatics into Europeans at a blow.

I take the liberty of warmly recommending to the attention of American readers the following article by Mr. Vladimir Holmstrem, some of the ideas in which I have myself suggested.

PRINCE E. OOKHTOMSKY.

"*Great are the battles that shall be fought in the time of peace!*" Such is the key-note of the Tsar's manifesto.

Throughout the world, in all the centres of public and political life in the two continents, much discussion has taken place during

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the last ten months as to the direct meaning of the Russian peace proposal and its probable bearing on the international situation. As is usual when dealing with Russia, the politicians, journalists and diplomatists of Europe, wholly ignorant of our domestic affairs and national character, have been profuse in their abuse of my country. Malevolent and spiteful criticism and sophistical interpretation of the great and humane design of the Tsar have not been wanting. Some critics have thought proper to hint at bad faith on the part of Russian diplomatists; others have maintained that a peaceful disposition on the part of the civilized nations of the day would, in the long run, prove disastrous to mankind, as it would diminish the physical and consequently the moral strength of the Christian nations, and render them incapable of withstanding the pressure of the barbarians. How weak a faith this opinion expresses in the forces that make for civilization! Because the Christian nations of the world would cease fighting *one another,* it is assumed that they would cease to hold their own against barbarians. Only an English journalist could commit himself to such an astoundingly foolish opinion! In the former case, as in the latter, it is ignorance that lies at the root of the misunderstanding, breeding distrust and fear. In days of yore the heathen, ignorant of the cause of thunder and lightning (which purifies the air) regarded these physical phenomena as the visible manifestations of angry deities or evil spirits. True knowledge and science have dissipated these misconceptions.

It is time that a truer appreciation of Russian national character, founded on real knowledge, should find its way to the heart of the great American nation, which has so much in common with Russia.

If the Russians were better known, if malicious European statesmen, past and present, did not strive to discredit our great Slavonic empire in the eyes of the West, the Tsar's peace manifesto would not have had, in the lands of the West, the effect of a bolt from the blue. The noble design of Nicolas II. is directly connected with the historical and national traditions of Russia, it is the direct outcome of Russian national thought, of the self-consciousness of the Russian people. Did not the late Tsar receive from Europe (Western Europe, too!) the name of Alexander "the Peace-Maker?" Does not Count Leo Tolstoï, in his reformatory zeal, carry his religious and social convictions

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to the verge of absurdity? In Russia we stand in no need of a Savanarola, with his ultra-sectarian creed, but we are bound to acknowledge that the great Catholic preacher *did* strike at the root of the evil of his time. The same is true in the case of Tolstoï, From amid numerous indications of the peaceful inclinations of Russian thought we shall take at random a most striking exposition of Russia's destiny, formulated by our famous national writer, Dostoyeffsky. According to this Russian literary authority, the ultimate object of our empire is to bring together in a harmonious whole all the nations of the earth, of which Russia includes in herself various representatives. "*Russia is a world, a universe!*"—such was Dostoyeffsky's creed and teaching. Without going so far as to accept this author's ideal in all its breadth, I think it necessary to remark that such a *profession de foi* implies in correspondence with it a truly Christian, brotherly love, peaceful disposition and tolerant feeling toward all nations and races, as indeed was loudly proclaimed by Dostoyeffsky.

"All possible freedom, on condition of acknowledging the highest Russian ideal of common interest and creed as developed in the service of the *idea of unity*"—such is Russia's internal policy as understood by her best representatives, who not infrequently wage war with the "tchinovniks" (officials of the State) on account of the false interpretation placed by the latter on this truth. The unity of Russia is personified in the Tsar and can find no other expression, such as parliament or congress, because such institutions would mean political slavery not only for the great mass of races of an inferior degree of civilization, but for the bulk of the Russian peasantry as well. *The Tsar is the expression of the national idea of Russia,* and therefore the enemy of the Tsar is the enemy of the people. The same may be said with regard to other nations and their national institutions. What, indeed, would Englishmen think if some of their countrymen were actively to oppose Parliament? What would be the attitude of Americans toward any one organizing opposition to Congress? The power of the Tsar no more limits freedom than do Congress or Parliament during the time that their members are actually in office. Russia's great misfortune is that the revolutionary tendencies of some mentally unbalanced people always threaten to call forth a reaction in the whole of her policy. The true enemies of Russia are the revolutionists. There remains, nevertheless, the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fact that the true conception of liberty is never lost sight of in the Russian empire *with its pronounced democratic tendencies.* Will Americans insist that their treatment of the Indians is in strict accordance with the ideal of liberty? No; the realization of this idea requires, in practice, certain limitations of its precepts. Do not the laws of America proclaim likewise that citizenship in the United States is acquired only under certain conditions, which proves that an emigrant from civilized Western Europe must undergo in America some process of assimilation? How much more, then, is this needed when a state has to deal with uncultured masses or inferior races! On the other hand, unrestricted liberty in a state containing inferior races among its population would mean the exploitation and decay of its uncultured elements.

Freedom for race and nationality in a firmly united whole is the ultimate aim of Russia, and the fate of Finland, so much talked about of late, is no exception to this object (not yet realized, it is true). I am no friend of those who have brought about the measures for curtailing the independence of Finland, nor do I approve of the means by which these measures have been passed; yet, nevertheless, I am bound to say that Finland *was* indeed a living contradiction to the idea of Russian unity. Would the people of the United States tolerate the existence of any territory that would claim all the rights and privileges of a State, and yet refuse to acknowledge its obligations as such—that would require special treatment as to its obligations? Certainly not! Yet such exactly was Finland's position in the Russian Empire, which gave her protection in time of peace and war, but received no acknowledgment of unity with the Russian *nation* corresponding to such treatment.

Turning to the Manifesto of the 24th of August, we shall say that by the issue of his peace proposal the Tsar has made known his adherence to the traditional ideal of Russia. He has indicated the internal and external policy which he means to carry out during his reign. He has likewise proclaimed his belief in Russia's spiritual strength. "Great are the battles that shall be fought in the time of peace!" It is surely an axiom that victory in actual warfare comes as the fruit of labor in all spheres of intellectual and economic life during the days of peace; victory rests, in the long run, with the party which has shown itself morally the stronger. The Spanish-American war affords ample

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

illustration of this truth! Battles and warfare are merely incidents in the life of nations, as are also plague, cholera, epidemics, revolutions, and, like them, can and must be prevented; the sagacious statesman *must* yield to pressure rather than enter into a war the results of which are likely to be disastrous. The Emperor of Russia has done no more than point out, at a time of an abnormal growth of militarism, that war should not be the ultimate aim of nations—that wars must be prevented.

By issuing his manifesto, Nicolas II. has challenged the nations to put forth in time of peace their utmost spiritual and moral strength, without playing blindman's buff, without tempting the "unknown," "*le dieu des batailles,*" as the French would say, without risking a fate which may always be predicted beforehand. The peace proposal also invites the diplomatists of various nations to base their schemes on some more solid foundation than that of all sorts of political combinations, "*au jour le jour,*" as chance may dictate; for moral strength and moral victory will depend in future on the degree in which the politics of a nation are natural and in accord with its needs, its past history, its origin and the geographical conditions of the country. In other words, the more natural a nation's policy, the greater will be its reserve force and the better its chances of victory in the peaceful spiritual contests of the future.

Viewed in the light of what has just been said, the position of America,* which has suddenly come to the front in the politics of the world, presents itself to the Russian mind in the following aspect. America is a *universe,* wherein the influence of the people of the United States predominates; it is a universe in the sense that it brings into close contact and harmony elements of various origin, creed and disposition, assimilating them one to another and welding them into an indissoluble whole. Anglo-Saxons, Celts, Germans, Slavs and Iberians, all experience the mighty influence of the great continent which they occupy. Their history, their national characteristics and their destiny are closely bound up with it. Whatever political vicissitudes may await the Americans in the future, whatever temporary interests may claim attention in different parts of the world, they will always be of a transitory character, because the one absorbing, all-embracing and determining interest of Americans centres in their own conti-

*I use the word "America" instead of "the United States" because the great republic stands in the same relation to the American continent as Russia does to Asia.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nent. The success which may attend the policy of the United States elsewhere will always depend on its success in the New World. This being admitted, it follows that in order to fulfill their destiny the United States must have their hands free on their own continent. But it is here that England blocks the way at all points and in every way. The imperialism of Canada, the fisheries of Newfoundland, the internationalization (which means English predominance, if anything) of the future sea route through the Nicaragua Canal, the tripartite rule (so rich in possible complication) on the Samoan Islands, the West Indies, and last, but not least, English influence in Central and South America—all these are questions that are bound to task the diplomatic powers of the Americans to their utmost. As is the case with Russia in Asia, both in the near and the far East, the Americans have to reckon everywhere in the New World with English designs and political aspirations. But in America, as in Asia, the English are mere outsiders, and in both continents their influence is artificial, enforced and temporary. The growth and ascendancy of the United States are bound to stimulate a corresponding development of self-consciousness in the various countries that border on them, and this means the victory of a healthy "Americanism," of the natural tendency toward closer union with the United States, and along with this the decline of the present artificially induced leaning toward England.

It follows that the future of the different countries lying within the sphere of influence of the United States depends on their emancipation from English influence.

Now, what are the advantages to the United States themselves of throwing in their lot with the English?

This question is the more opportune in that, according to what Prince Ookhtomsky has said, the history of the growth and development of the United States as a nation is a record of gradual emancipation from England. Now that the great American commonwealth has begun its career as a world-power, it must cast off the shackles of British tutelage, as was done by the ancestors of the nation when they sought spiritual liberty, and as was gloriously done a second time in the name of national independence. Now for a third time the Americans must assert their independence, if they mean to work out their own salvation and be ready to release their future states from the grip of the English.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is now universally admitted that the friendship exhibited toward the Americans by their "cousins across the water" during the Hispano-American war and the Philippine difficulties, was due to the fact that the English realized the danger they would run in defying the great American Republic, with a hostile Europe at their backs to emphasize their isolation. Matters have changed since then; the "cousins" of the Americans have sought and all but gained the friendship of Germany, and that renowned conjurer, Mr. Chamberlain, once so enthusiastic about an Anglo-American alliance, now attempts to swallow two swords at once: one, Canada, on the Western continent; the other, Germany, in Europe. Both are directed against the United States, as the latter have had ample opportunity for seeing. Yes, matters have changed, but the lesson to be learnt from these facts is that, in order to paralyze the hostile designs of England, the diplomatists of the United States should seek to create a combination in Europe (say Russia, France and Spain) which would hold England in check and make opposition to the United States impossible to her. Such a combination, in order to have a working effect, notwithstanding the world's events, need not be accomplished in reality, but may remain as an ideal, regulating the future attitude of England. *Nolens volens,* the politicians of England will have to hearken to the voice of Berlin, so long as they wish to keep Germany on their side. We have had some inkling of this game in the Samoan question. Americans will perhaps say that on this occasion the English stood by them to the extent of rousing a storm in the German press. But with regard to this I must beg leave to differ from my American readers. The Samoan commission has not yet finished, scarce even begun, its work, and, as fresh food for our suspicions, we find, at the most critical stage of the Samoan complications, the British press "lying low," uncertain whether it would be best to give away Germany or the United States. The former, realizing the uncertainty of English character with its "tall talk," tried to prevent the defection of England. They succeeded, and the Germans were indeed right in representing the nomination of a commission as a triumph of German policy.

Now the case of Samoa foreshadows the possibility of England's creating the same combination of powers in questions of vital interest to the United States, should the latter fail to find a set-off against their "cousins across the water."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Altogether the co-operation of England and Germany looks very ugly. With respect to the effusive declarations of good faith on the part of the English, the mere fact of such co-operation scarcely needs any commentary. The one serves as stalking-horse to the other, while their mutual solidarity is undoubted. Under the auspices of the Emperor William, Germany has embarked on a far-reaching policy of conquest in all parts of the world, and, engaged in universal incendiarism, tests the strength of her "mailed fist" in various quarters of the globe. Her ventures in Kiao-Chao, the Philippines, Samoa, the Caroline Islands, Crete (which, however, she has lost in spite of all her endeavors), Palestine, Persia and South America, her friendship with the Sultan and rejection of the Armenians, her reconciliation with Cecil Rhodes and her betrayal of the Boers in view of certain problematic advantages for German capital—all this shows that England should know very well whom she is supporting.

It seems almost superfluous for me to point out that the adventurous policy of the Germans is directed as much against Russia (in Austria, the Balkan States, Palestine, Persia and China) as against the United States (in the Philippines, Samoa, the Caroline Islands, China and South America), and that therefore mutual co-operation and good will between these two countries would go far to neutralize the mischievous schemes of the Anglo-German association.

But, however important the above questions may be from an international point of view, the real centre of political speculation in our day is undoubtedly China, and it is with regard to the Celestial Empire that the policies of different countries are now shaped. China is the touchstone for these policies, and the course of events affords me ample justification for maintaining that co-operation and a good understanding between Russia and the United States would be nowhere so complete, so natural and so much to the interest of both parties as in the task of upholding the integrity and the independence of the Celestial Empire.

I shall now demonstrate that in the Chinese question England has already outwitted the Americans.

The Chinese question, in its aspect at the present moment, resolves itself into the acknowledgement or the negation by the great powers of the integrity and the independence of this great empire of the far East. Now in all countries there are and naturally

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

must be very different opinions in circulation as to the policy to be followed with regard to this question. But when problems of extreme national and international gravity arise for solution, every country brings forth representative men who express its national thought, who personify and, so to speak, condense in themselves the national aspect of the questions at issue. As it has always been and always will be, so, undoubtedly, it is now. History repeats itself. Russia's opinion is expressed with much vigor, precision and penetration by Prince Ookhtomsky, while a striking example of American breadth of mind, thoroughness, practical common sense and truly Christian feeling is to be found in the Rev. Gilbert Reid's scheme for an international institute in Pekin, which is nothing else but an attempt to uphold the independence of China by the best means at the disposal of the Americans. And finally comes Lord Charles Beresford, personifying the policy of England by the aggressiveness of his demeanor, by his provocative attitude, by the revolutionary natures of the measures devised by him for saving China—for England! Admiral Beresford, however, is held—whether justly or unjustly, it is not for us to decide—by the London press to be too much a man of deeds to duly appreciate his facts; he was but an emissary, he has fulfilled a mission not wholly self-imposed, and behind him stand such men as Colquhoun and Archibald Little, who may be regarded as men expressing the *mind* of the English Government, as the Admiral is one of their men of action.

It requires no great degree of penetration to perceive that there is far more in common between the opinions of Prince Ookhtomsky and those of Gilbert Reid than between the Admiral, with his warlike programme, and the two former, with their peaceful inclinations.

I have shown elsewhere that Russia's advance through the Asiatic continent was a peaceful movement, bearing with it the seeds of culture for barbarous tribes and fulfilling a destiny that has never been lost sight of during the last 300 years. In accordance with these historical facts, Prince Ookhtomsky claims for Russia the post of guardian of the East, the peaceful development of which on the strictly national lines in accordance with the characteristic individuality of its races is essential to Russia's welfare. We are an Asiatic power, and as such must guard the East, because *its consolidation means our own consolidation.* The fear

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

expressed by English politicians that such a process may end in the absorption of China is simple nonsense; we *may* be forced into the policy of absorbing a nation of four hundred million souls, but of our own free will we shall never commit a piece of folly which would mean the creation of a second and greater Celestial Empire doomed by its very vastness to lack of energy. We are quite sincere in wishing to have a strong and friendly neighbor in Asia, and up to the present moment it is the English alone who, keeping in mind their sinister schemes for the creation of a second Egypt or India, have endeavored to represent us as hostile to China and a military aggressive power. Who in the whole of the nineteenth century has been aggressive in dealing with China? England, France, Japan and Germany—not Russia! The English are apt to point out that our Siberian railway, passing as it does through Manchuria, threatens the independence of China, and implies hostile designs on that empire. But in the original plan the Trans-Siberian railway never so much as touched Manchuria! It was Japan's *coup de force* that showed us the perils in store for us in Manchuria unless we held ourselves on the alert. Neither did we purpose going to Port Arthur in a military capacity; it was Germany's occupation of Kiao-Chao that forced us to make such a move. Nevertheless, even after Germany's raid on China, numerous voices were raised in Russia against the occupation of Port Arthur.

I repeat that the independence and integrity of China is a fundamental principle of Russian policy in Asia. On the other hand, Mr. Gilbert Reid thinks of upholding the Chinese Government by improving the ruling classes and the *literati;* he would reach the masses by the best channel, through the established power, the classes. Instead of sweeping them away by a revolution which would rob the people of their natural leaders and bring on the disruption of the land, attended by unspeakable misery for all, he intends to utilize the forces now existing. Certainly he has a practical mind; he realizes that the carrying out of his scheme by the co-operation of all the powers, the bringing them into close and friendly contact in the task of promoting China's welfare and enlightenment, would save the empire from being torn to pieces, and that consequently the "open door," as implying the integrity and independence of China, would be preserved, American trade promoted and American influence maintained. Such a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

humane interpretation of the idea of business, as bringing fresh power and salvation to people, commends itself to the Russian mind; hitherto we have been accustomed to see "business" interpreted in the English sense of rapine and slavery—economic and political—the famous murder for gain!

Mr. Reid's scheme clearly shows that the United States are vitally interested in the independence and integrity of China, and as he does not propose to transform the Asiatics, by means of a revolution—after the English idea—into Europeans, but means to let them govern themselves and remain Chinese, the identity of Russia's and America's aims in Eastern Asia with regard to the support of China becomes very clear.

When we turn to English policy in China we are struck by the mass of contradictions to be met with, not only in the different points of view held and the opinions professed by English politicians, but in the action of the government and in the speeches of responsible ministers as well.

The cry for the "open door," raised a year ago in England, has introduced a catchword intended to emphasize the importance of the integrity and independence of China. In the name of this new deity, which the English invoked as the heathen used to call on Baal, they sought to form a combination of powers hostile to Russia. But as the Japanese were the first to point out (and it must be said that none else but Russia should be more sincere in their endeavors to uphold the independence of China) a combination of four powers—England, Germany, the United States and Japan—would simply be a fighting machine to clear the way for *English conquest*. In the far East, England has to reckon with Russia's supremacy alone, and once this supremacy is paralyzed the other powers would be helpless against England. On the other hand, as Russia's position in Asia is assured to her by the mere fact of her existence, and all opposition to her must prove useless in the long run, the first thing the English would do after creating an anti-Russian combination of powers would be to come to an agreement with her for the partition of China. At the present moment it is impossible for England to carry out such a plan, as Russia adheres to the principle of integrity, although an inkling of such a possibility has been afforded by the recent Anglo-Russian "railway" agreement. If this famous "agreement" went no further at the outset, it was owing to the fact that England

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

had shown unmistakably that her "open door" creed was insincere.

While awaiting the results of her agitation for a combination against Russia, England was gradually but surely establishing herself in China. From the very outset it was clearly and persistently demonstrated in the columns of the *St. Petersburg Viedomosti* that the upholding of the integrity of China was not in the traditions of British diplomacy. Egypt and India were living contradictions to English assurances. "The banner with the 'open door' inscribed upon it," I wrote a year ago in a leader in the *St. Petersburg Viedomosti,* "which England waves so furiously before the eyes of the desired anti-Russian 'concert of powers' is nothing else but the scarlet cape of the Spanish bull-fighter, which is meant to blind the bull and make him an easy prey to the aggressor. It only affords England the opportunity of plundering China elsewhere as much as her heart can wish." And I further cited that famous speech of Mr. Curzon's at Southampton (in 1896 or 1897) in which this responsible minister of the Crown acknowledged that one must not take too literally the expression that England stands for the integrity of the Ottoman Empire, as *integrity in this case means gradual dissolution.*

Well, hardly a year has passed since I wrote that article, and already England has committed herself to the policy of the partition of China by acknowledging the German "sphere of interest" in Shan-tung, by taking over Wei-hai-Wei, by extending her territory in Kan-lung, on the mainland opposite Hong-Kong, an area of thirty-seven square miles, with a population of 100,000 souls and a very rich soil, abundant mineral wealth and pearl fisheries; she has also invited the Italians to China and given her support to their demands for a lease of Chinese territory in Sammun bay. In the meantime, under cover of the "open door" principle, the English have acquired concessions for 2,800 miles of railway in China, they have been guaranteed the non-alienation of the valley of the Yang-tse, in Shanghai and Hankow; they have successfully opposed (with the aid of United States counsuls and ambassadors!) the applications for concessions made by subjects of other powers in the name of the "open door;"* they are drilling

* As the Rev. Gilbert Reid has wittily remarked in his vigorous article in the *National Review* for December, 1898: "Whenever the Chinese give a concession to somebody the English raise the cry: China is dealing with others—the 'open door' is closed."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Chinese in Wei-hai-Wei and are planning to organize a Chinese army and navy within their "sphere of influence." Add to this a British subject as Inspector-General of Maritime Customs, and the picture of the gradual absorption of China by England becomes complete.

Do my American readers really think that the Russian railway across Manchuria is such a menace, after all, to China in particular and the world in general? Where would China now be, did England feel no restraint, experience no opposition to her designs from Russia? How far would not Germany push into the interior of China if we were not at Port Arthur? Which, also, is more pernicious to the interests of the Americans: the Russian railway in Manchuria, facilitating transport and supplying influence of no exclusive character, probably to be exerted for the benefit of America, or the annexation by the British of all the principal elements of the social life of China, of all the branches of her industry, trade and administration, thus instituting a practical, if not a theoretical, protectorate of Great Britain over the whole of China? This protectorate will become the more real inasmuch as the English are sure to create industries on a vast scale in the Celestial Empire to compete with the labor of the American workman.

Genuine piquancy is added to the situation by the appointment as Viceroy of India, in close neighborhood to the Empire whose integrity the English intend to protect, of Lord Curzon of Kedleston, the very man who in all sincerity acknowledges his belief that *integrity means gradual dissolution.*

Having acquired, under the cover of the "open door" theory, leases of territory and various concessions, the English have now obtained all they wanted, and, casting aside the principle of the "open door," mean to try their luck in a different direction. The "sphere of influence" or of "interest" now comes on the scene.

We have shown how all the time that they were professing an interest in China's integrity and independence the English were always ready to share something or other in China with any one who asked for it, provided always he had no title to his claim and could not support it against the English. Fancy partitioning China with Germany, pegging out claims as if they were in Africa, or with Italy! Would it not be a stroke of luck, especially as it would set Germany against Russia, and as the Italians have no

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

trade worth speaking of with China, it not being even shown in the commercial reports.* The Italians would remain in Sammun bay and England would begin her conquest of the interior of the country.

For conquest is the real word that describes England's policy in China!

I have tried to show that the policy followed by the British government in China is full of contradictions and ambiguity. There are some good souls in England who in their innocence denounce the Unionist government for the *blunders* it has committed. But, for my part, I thoroughly agree with those enthusiastic patriots who maintain that Lord Salisbury's cabinet has deserved well of the nation. Notwithstanding all the contradictions mentioned and the loud proclamation of the integrity of the Celestial Empire, England is successfully engaged in carving out for herself an empire in China. The attitude of Her Majesty's ministers has hitherto been quite consistent with the advice tendered to them from competent quarters and by authorities on the Chinese question. Such writers as Colquhoun and Archibald Little have invariably counselled the absorption of the best parts of China, *i. e.*, of the Yang-tse valley; journals like the London *Speaker* have pointed out that it would be better to begin the absorption of the Celestial Empire from some nook or corner of it, and we find that the Kan-lung extension granted to England only last July and lately taken over by the Hong-Kong authorities has already given the English occasion to talk of rectifying the boundary line, with a view to penetrating further into the country. The following is the sort of advice which, in veiled sentences, Mr. Archibald Little has been giving to the government: "*If all the other European nations have determined to partition China, and our pacific remonstrances* (*i. e.*, the "open door" pretext) *are of no avail, then, I take it, it is the duty of the Government to see that Britain takes the lion's share,*"† (I wonder what to call the policy of a country that wishes to take the lion's share of a neighbor's territory! As if this wish is not already expressing itself in action. Such exactly has been England's policy.) *if only as a stake and means of bargain for the 'open door' with the rival pow-*

* This is a fresh instance of English insincerity: she opposes Russia on the grounds that the latter's trade with China is small (just as if it could not increase) and yet supports Italy, which has *no* trade at all with that country.

† *Imperial and Asiatic Quarterly Review*, January, 1899.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ers (this is a cover for the real meaning of the phrase, for how is it possible to partition China in the interests of the "open door?) *and further as a means of training the Chinese and enabling them later on to undertake their own self-defence."* (This is a little better: the English mean to partition China in the interest of her future integrity and independence.) Mr. Colquhoun is still more outspoken in advising the Government *"the construction of a railway system throughout the country, the use of steam navigation on all the waterways, the opening of the mines;"* this eminent writer imparts to these schemes for improving commercial intercourse the aspect of means for carrying out the absorption of the country by England and boldly asserts that *"the province of Czechuan must be the commercial and political object of England. Recent events should induce us to deal, without delay, with the question of land communication between Burma and the Upper Yang-tse, for it is there that must be decided the question of the supremacy of Central China."* What this guarded sentence means is clearly indicated in another sentence in the same volume: *"It is from Burma on the one hand and from Shanghai and Hong-kong on the other, that England must, by the aid of steam applied overland and by water, effectively occupy the Upper Yang-tse region, the key of our position in China. China has ceased to be a buffer and England must effectively occupy the Yang-tse region and Southern China, if she seriously means to hold her own."*

This is plain speaking, indeed! *The occupation of the Yang-tse region and of Southern China* is the political object of England. After such an assertion, in what light must we regard the violent diatribes of Mr. Colquhoun against Russia, in which he indulges throughout the whole of his book, trying to represent Russia as a positive menace to the integrity of China and to the world at large, and speaking of her as engaged in a career of purely military quest? Furthermore, Mr. Colquhoun says: "China knows that the policy of England, whatever it may have been, is now one of commercial expansion and development only, untainted by any ulterior designs, and that while England wants Chinese trade Russia wants Chinese provinces." "It was our duty to take China into tutelage," he says further on, and then quotes Colonel Mark Bell: "The latent wealth of China is undoubted. She is of greater value than many Indias; her people are peace-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ful, tractable and easily ruled." What an astounding mass of hypocrisy !

Now compare the policy of England in China, as advised by Mr. Colquhoun, with that of the Rev. Gilbert Reid and Prince Ookhtomsky. "The policy of the maritime nations" (read "England"), says the first named writer, "is to strengthen their position and influence in Pekin, and toward that end to *induce* China—by pressure, if necessary—to adopt measures which would be of advantage to all the world, including herself. Foremost among these measures is the opening of the country to foreign enterprise and capital by means of communications, railways and waterways, for they are necessary preliminaries to administrative reforms."

Whereas Prince Ookhtomsky and the Rev. Gilbert Reid are for strengthening the Chinese government, with a view of rendering it capable of fulfilling its obligations, and through it of bringing peace and welfare to the people—the English, on the contrary, think of strengthening their *own* position in Pekin, they want to *induce* China to adopt various measurses, and mean to improve ways of communication in the country in order to absorb the Yang-tse valley. And in the background are administrative reforms, which signify a sort of practical control of China by the "maritime nations."

The ideas of Prince Ookhtomsky and the measures proposed by the Rev. Gilbert Reid, as representing respectively Russia and the United States, are *conservative* in the best application of the word, they aim at the welfare of an independent nation, while on the other hand the English schemes are *revolutionary* in theory and meant to be carried out by violence in order to pander to the lust of the English for gain and conquest.

Mr. Colquhoun's policy has been adopted by the English government in all its details: the advance from Burma, Shanghai and Hong-Kong was begun at all three points simultaneously. "For the safety of China and India," Mr. Curzon was created Lord Curzon of Kedleston, the "Hong-Kong extension" assumed the character of a formidable advance, and in Shanghai the English were lucky enough to secure the co-operation of the representatives of the United States.

Lord Charles Beresford was sent on a secret mission to China in order to inspect the field of the future military operations of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the English, and has brought back a report, under the title of "The Break-up of China," in which he acknowledges himself a believer in the "open door," at the same time cleverly distributing his lights and shadows and concentrating his attention on Russia's claims in Hankow and Newchwang. The gallant Admiral has not been fortunate in his conclusions, as the pressmen and the politicians of England have changed their mind in the meantime and now prefer the "sphere of interest" policy to any other. The "administrative reforms" devised by Lord Charles Beresford all tend to give England a dominating influence in China, and the "open door" that is to save China is, according to the Admiral, sort of English protectorate over the Celestial Empire.

With a view of securing this protectorate for England, Lord Charles Beresford advocates an alliance between England, Germany, the United States and Japan in the Far East. The idea of the Anglo-Saxon world-supremacy has also been put forward. We shall, however, allow ourselves to ask whether the Latin races fared so well after co-operating with the English in the Crimean war that the Anglo-Saxon races should feel inclined to follow their example? The Crimean war was also waged in the name of the integrity of an empire—the Ottoman one—and in the end England has gained Egypt and Cyprus, while as to the other powers—well, France has her Catholic protectorate in Asia Minor, and Italy, as a legacy from the royal house of Savoy, a share in the keeping of the neutrality of the Mediterranean!

These bare facts will perhaps lead one to pause before accepting alliances proposed by admirals, the more so that England already stands convicted of breach of faith in the Chinese question: she tried to rouse in the United States an enthusiasm for the open door, and in the meantime was working on the lines of a "sphere of influence" policy; she took over Wei-hai-Wei from the Chinese on the avowed pretext of upholding the integrity of China, which, as the English maintained, was menaced by us, and never thought of upholding China's integrity against Germany, invited Italy to take a share in the spoiling of the empire, and yet still keeps Wei-hai-Wei (as she keeps Cyprus, though she neither helped the Armenians nor saved Turkey from dismemberment). *

*The "*Times*" has just published a letter from Admiral Colomb to the effect that it would be convenient to give over Wei-hai-Wei to Germany. Yet these people speak of our attempt on the integrity of Chica, while thinking of giving away territory they have no right to cede to the power which first made such an attempt.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We have dwelt so long on the question of English policy in China because it shows the great gulf separating the conceptions of a Chinese policy entertained on the one hand by Russia and the United States, and by England on the other. The same remark might be made about other spheres of life and thought: to a student of English and American politics it is clear how radically different are the ideas held by these two "cousins across the water." It would lead us too far, however, to enter into details.

My opinion on this subject being firm, I have never been a believer in an Anglo-American alliance, or any other understanding of the sort. In the first place, there is absolutely no ground for it in the respective dispositions of the two nations. Mr. Bookwalter, of Ohio, that well-known American who created quite a sensation in Russia by his powers of observation and ready American wit, bears testimony to the fact that the English movement toward fraternization with the Americans is entirely artificial, has no root in the disposition of the people, and is dictated solely by motives of political speculation. The English only gained credit in Europe by their talk of an Anglo-American alliance and in consequence pocketed Egypt by the fact of their claims to the Soudan remaining undisputed. But what have the United States gained by this talk? "Cuba and the Philippines," say the English, and this is offensive and humiliating for the Americans, who should never forget that England attempted to further utilize their difficulties by forcing on them the Canada commission. On the other hand the idea of a cordial Anglo-American understanding was generated in England by the circumstance of the latter's isolation (not always voluntary), and was forced on the English by their realizing that they could not deal with the Americans in a high-handed way.

Next comes the question: What would America gain by such an understanding? I will dismiss it with the remark that it has hitherto only given rise to such astounding articles as that by Sir Richard Temple in the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW for September last. He estimates the number of millions of population in the "European" and the "Anglo-Saxon" combinations respectively (221 million whites and 64 million colored, as against 125 million whites and 350 million colored), attempts to compare their areas in square miles, their coast lines, their railways, trade returns, banking facilities, millions of horse power, etc. The re-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sult is a triumphant proof of the superiority of the Anglo-Saxon. These are but idle speculations! The author might as well have estimated the respective forces of the beasts of the forest and those of the prairies and deserts, adding up horns, claws, teeth, tails, animal force, agility and density of fur! I should like to see him general in command of the 475 millions of the "Anglo-Saxon" combination!

But Mr. David Mills, Canadian Minister of Justice, goes even further than this in the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW for last June. "Which shall dominate, Saxon or Slav?" he exclaims, and decides for the Saxon, who loves commerce, as against the Slav, the barbarian, who loves domination. We are so accustomed to fits of blind, uncultured and ignorant Russophobia among English writers that we have come to view them with indifference. But it might be remarked that to *raise the question of domination* is a peculiar feature of the "Anglo-Saxon" temperament, and that the author's political lucubrations are tantamount to a propaganda of race hatred.

"I believe that Russia is the only country in the world which feels nationally friendly and individually interested in America." Such is the just and acute remark made by a fair American, Lilian Bell, which I came across in the "Woman's Home Companion" for March, 1899. It afforded me real pleasure, as, coming from the heart, it added one more to the number of the sypmtoms of goodwill and friendly feeling between our respective peoples. Of late years many Americans have visited our country, carrying away with them the best possible impressions of it and a feeling of being liked by the Russians. The significance of this coincidence of feeling and hearty goodwill has been further emphasized by facts pointing to solidarity of thought and many points of contact in the intellectual region. American books and journals convey ideas freely to the Russian mind, and these ideas find a ready response among us. Our famous writer, Tolstoï, has nowhere roused greater enthusiasm than in America, while Emerson gives ample nourishment to Russian thought. Men like the Rev. Gilbert Reid emphasize this Russo-American solidarity, not only in aims but in appreciation of facts and policies; likewise, his criticism of British policy in China is identical almost word for word with the views which have been expressed in the *St. Petersburg Viedomosti* during the last four years.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Nor is this all. The position of Russia and of the United States in their respective continents is identical. Both are self-contained, self-supporting communities, with a destiny naturally imposed upon them by the prominent place they occupy, each in its own sphere and within its boundaries. Their expansion in their respective continents has been a natural movement, paralleled only in the case of China; it has been peaceful in the main and brought enlightenment and the higher civilization in its train. I have shown elsewhere what the character of Russian expansion in Asia has been. The wars that Russia waged in Europe were carried on in self-defence against the pressure of the Teutonic Order, against the Swedes, the Poles and the Turks. Russia saved Europe from the hordes of Asia, and the mere fact of her growth enabled the Balkan States to throw off the Turkish yoke, the weight of which was once felt as far as the walls of Vienna. The peaceable disposition of Russia in Europe is evident from the fact that during the whole of the present century Russia has never been the aggressor in Europe: * other nations have risen in arms against her, but with no success worth mentioning. Continuing to demonstrate the identity of the positions of Russia and the United States we must remark that both these countries, as well as China, are, each in its own sphere, a *world*, a universe, wherein various races and creeds are brought together into a harmonious whole, and I sometimes think that if ever the union of the churches were to become an accomplished fact, it would be in America. Both countries, too, afford opportunities for liberty in the highest sense of the word, as founded on genuine equality of rights, and certainly realize this idea more than any other country. The Tsardom of Russia rests on a democratic foundation; the Russian Tsars have always fought for the masses against the classes, whenever the latter have shown a tendency to oligarchy and caste exclusiveness. The Tsar is always the Tsar of the Commons, of the common people whom he has freed from serfdom, although it is admitted that existence of the classes is a condition of regular and healthy life for the community. Our nihilists are maniacs in their good intentions, corresponding to the anarchists of Western civilization; as are the latter, so are the former, the expression of some unhealthy symptom in the life of the nation.

*The wars with Turkey, it must be remembered, were waged, not for any purpose of aggrandizement, but solely in defence of the oppressed nationalities of the Balkan peninsula and of Christianity in the East, and therefore Russia was not the real aggressor, even when she was the first to declare war.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The identity of interests between our respective countries springs from their requirements, as self-supporting communities, in the best conditions for the development of their faculties and the fulfillment of their destiny. Russia and the United States have a common interest in seeing the road they follow cleared from obstacles without their coming into conflict with one another. The Russo-American understanding we now advocate is no alliance, no agreement on all or on some points or, indeed, on any particular point, but simply co-operation of a spiritual nature founded on mutual goodwill and a strong inclination to keep the peace on every occasion. We have common foes, bent on mischief, as Americans will soon realize on their own continent; it would be well for us to reach one another a helping hand where needed.

It is not for the first time that such co-operation has taken place between the two nations, nor, indeed, are we the first to point out that identity of the destinies of Russia and the United States which promises so well for our respective futures. Great thinkers, philosophers and historians have remarked this before. We shall quote one of them, the celebrated French historian, Tocqueville, who in 1864 thus expressed himself in his book, *"De la Democratie en Amérique"*: *"Voici un fait entièrement nouveau dans le monde et dont l'imagination elle-même ne saurait saisir la portée. Il y a oujourdhui sur la terre grands peuples qui, partis de points différents, semblent s'avancer vers le même but; ces sont les Russes et les Américains. Tous deux ont grandi dans l'obscurité et tandis que les regards des hommes étaient occupés ailleurs, ils se sont placés tout à coup au premier rang des nations, et le monde, a appris presque en même temps leur naissance et leur grandeur. Tous les autres peuples paraissent avoir atteint à peu près les limites qu'a tracées la nature, et n'avoir plus qu'à conserver; mais eux sont en croissance; tous les autres sont arrêtés ou n'avancent qu'avec mille efforts; eux seuls marchent d'un pas aisé et rapide dans une carriére dont l'oeil ne saurait encore apercevoir la borne. L'Américain lutte contre les obstacles, que lui oppose la nature, le Russe est aux prises avec les hommes. L'un combat le désert et la barbarie; L'autre la civilisation—revêtue de toutes ses armes; aussi les conquétes de l'Américain se font-elles avec le soc du laboureur, celles du Russe avec l'épée du soldat."* This last sentence shows that Tocqueville could *not* predict all the incidents of the future he had in view, and that he had no knowledge of Russia's

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for the most part peaceful record in Asia, no knowledge of the incessant toil of the Russian peasant settler and Cossack in Siberia.

It is highly significant that on all occasions of great importance in the history of the two nations mutual friendly co-operation was always forthcoming, though proffered in various forms. It was so during the American war for independence, again during the civil war, when England threatened the North, and again when Alsaka was ceded to the republic, when she had gained strength enough to hold her own. Russia, on the other hand, secured her possessions at the mouth of the Amoor, in the Far East, in 1846, with the co-operation of the Russo-American trading company, which carried out the explorations of the mouth of the river and established trading relations with the Ghilak natives. In 1851, by order of the Tsar, the Nikolayefsky military post was transformed into a factory of the Russo-American company. It is with profound gratitude that we Russians remember the ship load of corn sent to us by our American friends during the famine of 1891-92.

Is it not also a fact of wonderful significance that just after Germany's raid on Kiao-Chao, which marked our coming to the front in the Far East, the United States should appear in the Philippines and prevent the English and the Germans from disposing of the many tangled questions in Eastern Asia at their will? Even in ceding Alaska according to the dictates of our own policy, we unconsciously benefited the Americans.

Our destinies, following their special lines, are developing in such harmony, are so mysteriously interwoven, that our mere existence is mutually beneficial! Facts have responded to the requirements of the time with more accuracy, more insight and more intrinsic significance than all the lucubrations of politicians on the set theme, that "blood is thicker than water." At the present critical epoch for the Far East Russia and America are again drawn to one another by invisible ties of friendship and goodwill. The question of China's integrity and independence absorbs the attention of all, and it rests with Russia and America, the two countries most naturally and most vitally interested in the normal development of the Far East, to determine the fate of a nation that belongs to the same order of self-contained, self-supporting and typical communities as they themselves, which is a vital part of the Far East, which in the past has developed into

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

an empire along the same lines as they have, expanding in a natural manner, uniting various elements into a harmonious whole and capable in the future of developing along lines of its own.

All depends on the standpoint taken with regard to China by the powers that now come into contact with her. There are two views held with respect to China: the Russian view of friendly help to an empire tottering under outside pressure—this is the conservative, the Asiatic, the Oriental conception; and the Anglo-German view of aggressive absorption in the name of reforms—which is the revolutionary conception of European outsiders, the Western conception.

I maintain that if America would be true to herself and to her noble traditions she must come over to our side and accept the Eastern conception.

The primary aim of Russia's expansion in Asia, according to Prince Ookhtomsky's formula, has, besides its political and economic basis, a moral one, too, which forms the essence of Russia's mission of culture and enlightenment in Asia. Our close relationship with the Asiatics imparts to our advance in their direction the character of a communion with the sources of our individuality, with the vital creative forces of spiritual greatness which were in a condition of dissolution for want of any inner creative work in the Asiatic native. We seek to unite in spirit with the races which carry in them the seeds of our national individuality. It is a brotherly union with a civilizing influence that we seek—one that has for its object the preservation to the Asiatic races of their originality, with a view to their participation in our common life and to their spiritual regeneration as well as ours. We must not forget that it was from Asia that the glorious principles of truth, of faith and of love were sent into the world for the salvation of mankind. Accordingly, the idea of intercommunion with the Asiatic races should be the object of every Christian and really civilized nation.

Ex Oriente Lux! This was said a long time ago, but the "*Oriens*" here meant exclusively the eastern shores of the Mediterranean, the birthplace of Christianity, which succeeded the civilization of Greece in those regions. It is time for this expression to be taken in a broader sense, for the word "*Oriens*" to receive a wider and a truer meaning. The eastern shores of the Mediterranean have always been in close, direct

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and living contact with the Farther East, from which it borrowed spiritual strength, and had only an original *form* for the expression of its spiritual essence. In substance, the latter was identical among the civilized Greeks and the "barbarians," but here the expression of the spiritual essence of life had taken a more perfect form under the influence of the climate, the facility of supporting life, the comparative freedom for intellectual life in consequence of the small amount of physical wear and tear necessary for human welfare, and finally the facility of communication which made the countries of the ancient world the centre of the universe. The forms were different, but the essence and its origin were one with those of the mystical conceptions of the inhabitants of Persia, Syria, Arabia, India, Central Asia and China. The force underlying the life of the ancient world was in reality, and notwithstanding the beauty of its form, a spiritual force proceeding from the Asiatic East (before the Christian era China was in constant communication with Western Asia, Arabia, Persia and India).

It is true that in the Western conception of the ancient history of the Greek and Roman period it is held that the glory of classic civilization lay in the forms of social life, in the realization of the idea of liberty, in republican principles, etc. But I allow myself a different opinion on the subject. In the ancient world liberty meant the subordination of the individual to the state, as representing the popular idea, his absorption by it: in other words, only the *cultured* man—*i. e.*, he who acknowledges the necessity of obedience to a common idea, and not a Jean Jacques Rousseau, seeking to return to a state of nature—was free, because he was free in the only possible way, in the spiritual sense of freedom for the development of thought and of the moral faculties. The forms of social life varied, but the idea of obedience to a common principle remained. Therein lay the greatness of the ancient world and of its civilization. It is so very true that the political forms of ancient life grew more definite, more elaborate, more *perfect*—as it is said—along with the waning of the spiritual power of the countries of the ancient world, as it fell to pieces under the pernicious influence of varied interests. The final development of the ancient political forms coincided with the disappearance of the spiritual power of the ancient state and its ensuing collapse: *the forms could not save when the indwelling spirit was gone.*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The primary source of the spirit lies in Asia; it dwells in the races of the East! This spiritual force has its root in the self-subsistence of the Asiatic continent, in the fact of its being a world in itself.

The nations and races of our modern civilization must therefore look to the East in order to shape the course of their advance, to correct the aberrations they are in danger of in their attempts to gain power for true unity. *Ex Oriente lux!*

All this is true with regard not only to Russia, but also to the United States and all those other countries as well which have inherited the traditions of ancient Greece and Rome, which have applied these principles to their democracies. The political forms inherited from the ancient world by the United States, in order to be *living* forms, the American democracy itself in order to be something *whole* and undivided, must keep in touch with the spiritual forces which are the symbol of unity—yea! which are unity itself—and which underlay that ancient civilization; the Americans must look far back and far into the Asiatic East in order to shape their progress. As Emerson said: "*He that will do anything well must come to it from a higher ground.*"

If the Americans view their progress toward Asia and their participation in the Asiatic question in the way I have indicated, this movement will mean to them increase of power and spiritual renovation, and will be heartily welcomed by the Russians. On the other hand, if they follow the lead of Great Britain and view their advance in the Asiatic East in the Western Anglo-German sense, as that of conquerors coming with the "mailed fist" to subdue the Oriental nations, dealing death and destruction to their spiritual individuality, then will they simply be committing suicide; they will destroy the foundations of their state and endanger their democracy, which will die out as Western imperialism gains ground.

Psychological and philosophical conceptions, it is true, are rarely grasped by the masses, whose advance is guided by some catch-word or truism. But a "*mot d'ordre*" may bear a special meaning and have a moral sense: in this instance siding with England will mean the destruction of China by revolutionary methods—and such destruction is not in the interests of the United States; it will also mean "murder for gain" in the name of trade. On the other hand, co-operation with Russia, the interest of which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in upholding the existence of China is of vital importance, will mean the preservation and strengthening of America's glorious traditions of peace and development along the lines of national conservatism, it will strengthen the true spirit of Christianity and healthy democracy.

May Heaven preserve America from the curse of Western imperialism with which England is now tempting her.

VLADIMIR HOLMSTREM.

P. S.—This article was already finished when the news was received of England's opposition to our demand from China of a concession for a railway to Pekin. This opposition is carried out in the face of the newly concluded "railway agreement!" It would be interesting to know on what this opposition is based; on the principle of the "open door," on equality of opportunity or on the "sphere of influence?" Every one of these principles excludes England's right to interfere in our present dealings with China!

It is also necessary to turn attention to the following facts. England always lifts up her voice in the name of trade, yet she opposes all our projects for railway transport, which is beneficial to the trade of every country, including England; on the other hand, England is planning to utilize the industrial and mining resources of China, although she thereby threatens the commercial prospects of the United States and of the United Kingdom as well.

V. H.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"AMERICANISM," TRUE AND FALSE.

BY THE REV. WILLIAM BARRY, D. D.

It has been a subject of surprise to many Americans that a controversy which was carried on in France and Italy, and which has now been decided at Rome, should have borne the title of "Americanism." What is the matter in dispute? How did it arise? And under what circumstances has Pope Leo XIII. judged it his duty to publish, in a solemn letter addressed to Cardinal Gibbons, as the representative of the American Hierarchy, that he "cannot approve of those opinions which, taken altogether, certain persons term" by that name. These are questions as momentous as they are reasonable. They deserve an answer; and in the following pages we shall make an attempt to give in outline the story of this chapter in recent events, as well as some explanation of the issues involved. It will then, we trust, be clear that there is a noble and necessary use of the word "Americanism," against which Pope Leo does not in any way set his face; while there is another, not necessary and far from noble, for which those are responsible who have employed it in a sense entirely foreign to the American people, but with a purpose which we shall do our best to unravel as we proceed.

The papal letter is an instruction,—one might almost call it a sermon,—in Catholic doctrine. But the incidents which led up to it have a strong political cast. For Americans, happily removed from the race-hatreds and inherited feuds which make of the continent of Europe a battlefield and an armed camp, it is not, perhaps, easy to take in so perplexed a situation. Yet, in fairness to their Catholic fellow-citizens, who have always deserved well of the Republic, they may not be unwilling to hear the account of this last struggle between Democracy on the one hand, and Imperialism on the other. Such are, in truth, the issues at stake.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Nor has Leo XIII. done anything more calculated to fulfill his programme of reconciliation than when he swept aside, with majestic insistence, the clouds of misunderstanding which had been conjured up by men who detest every form of free government, and who dreamt that they could ruin the leaders of Catholicism in the United States, by fastening on them an imputation of unsound and heretical teaching. That effort has been foiled. The Pope condemns no American prelate; he is careful not to take upon himself the burden of baptizing as American, opinions which run counter to elementary Christian principles; nay, he guards himself explicitly against disowning the word itself, in a passage that will long be cited as the Magna Charta of American Catholic freedom. "If by that name," he writes, "are to be understood certain admirable qualities of mind which adorn the American people, as other nations have their own gifts; and again, if thereby is meant your political condition, and the laws and customs which you enjoy, there is no reason at all to take exception to it." But precisely this, and no other, has been the Americanism of Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop Ireland, Archbishop Keane, and those associated with them, who for years have been insisting that, between the Constitution of the United States and the principles of the Catholic Church, not only does there exist no opposition, but there is a deep and Providential harmony. This, too, was the key note of Isaac Hecker's life, the lesson which he was ever repeating, and his distinctive text as a religious philosopher contemplating the task and the destiny of nations. It has now been affirmed by the Head of the Church, under circumstances in which every human influence had been brought to bear upon him, in the hope that he would unsay or soften, or in some degree modify what his legate, Cardinal Satolli, had proclaimed at Chicago, "Go forward, in one hand bearing the Book of Christian truth, and in the other the Constitution of the United States."*

If this be so, men will ask, how comes a system of false doctrine to have thrust itself in the way, and usurped a name which it desecrates? That is a long but not a doubtful story. We know the writers who have done this thing; we know why they have done it. The literature—if a series of violent and uncritical diatribes may be so termed—in which their platform lies open

*Satolli: "Loyalty to Church and State," original American edition, p. 150.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to the world, can be read in more than one language; and melancholy reading it is.

To comprehend how it arose, we must look back to the year 1887, or even earlier, and take a view of the Papal policy on both sides of the Atlantic. The starting point is fixed by those measures, which Pope Leo designed as a means of reconciling the church with the French Republic.

Thereby he gave the death-blow to Legitimism,—that singular Jacobite apparition in the nineteenth century,—but by the same stroke he created the "Irreconcilables," *les refractaires*, who declined his guidance and held on in their entrenched isolation. It was whispered in their councils that the Pope had been brought round to Democracy by American prelates, on whom he was then showering his favors. We all remember the episode of the "Knights of Labor," saved from condemnation by the Cardinal of Baltimore. Then came the setting up of a University at Washington; the many gracious acts which accompanied the centenary of the American church, and the despatch of a Papal delegate to the United States. Every sign foreboded a new and Democratic era. Old things were passing away.

But there was a mighty Power across the Rhine, which looked on with rage and misgiving at a change so full of danger to its own *prestige*. Was Europe going to be Republican, and the Pope to bless popular constitutions? Words of warning, of menace, escaped from Imperial lips. In a celebrated interview at the Vatican, as is credibly reported, the young ruler of Germany, who had learned his lesson well, intimated that he had no wish to renew the *Kulturkampf*, but the Pope must not strengthen the hands of Democracy, or consequences would follow. We have seen, during the late war, who was the most determined antagonist of the United States, short of actual hostilities; and now it is said that the stream of German emigration is to be guided from New York to South America,—signs these, which cannot be misconstrued, of an uneasy feeling at Berlin that the great Western Republic is infecting all nations with its passion for free institutions and its hatred of an absolute, even though paternal, government, such as William II. exercises *von Gottes Gnaden*. Thus in Germany was the motive-power, in France the material, of an assault upon American principles, with Rome and the Papacy as a possible conquest,—all in the interests of Imperialism.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Much more could be stated which, one day, will doubtless come to light. But enough is here set down to give the reader some indication of causes, deep and formidable, which will account for an explosion so sudden, at three different centres, of fury against "Americanism," as a disturber of European peace. The Legitimist, the Imperialist, "the man of yesterday"—the party which in France has pursued Dreyfus to extermination; which in Italy is accused of coquetting with Socialists to overturn the monarchy; which has learned nothing and forgotten nothing since 1848—saw itself confronted with a new enemy, and that enemy America. The Franco-Latin world had been shaken to its foundations by the triumph of an English-speaking race over Spain in Cuba. And if anything was to be undertaken by way of safeguard or revenge, American Catholics stood in the front, the first line of battle, and resting on Rome. At Rome, accordingly, they have been assailed.

But the focus of debate was in Paris. Ever since the Pope had urged French Catholics to rally round the Third Republic and make the best of it, a movement had been going on which, while drawing to itself many of the younger clergy and some of the more eminent, had called forth a reaction as determined as it was powerful in the press and elsewhere. The "young Catholics" were bent on reconciliation wherever it was compatible with orthodox principles; and though, in the province of Bible criticism or historical investigation, they could not look to America for guidance,—since America is not the home of such studies,—yet in a certain largeness of spirit, in a temper at once candid and virile, it did appear to them that the New World set them an example. There was an outburst of enthusiasm, not unlike the Anglomania of a century ago, for American ideas and persons. Archbishop Ireland, who is an eloquent French orator, was requested to explain before an audience not unworthy of him, how it came to pass that the Church flourished across the Atlantic so marvellously, and what was the secret of its success. He replied by pointing to the freedom from state interference in matters of religion, or, as we may say, the Church's happy self-government, under a constitution which made Cæsarism impossible. He did not touch on the burning question of the Concordat. Everyone is aware that, by a single vote and in one sitting, the French Chamber could suppress what is termed *"le budget des cultes,"* in other words, it might, and perhaps will, some day or other, disendow

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

if not disestablish the Church in France, without warning or remorse. But, evidently, on so delicate a theme, neither Archbishop Ireland nor any foreign Catholic could offer an opinion.

In the boundless deluge of pamphlets and articles which have strewn the Paris boulevards since Americanism became a fashionable topic, we shall find no contributions from Americans. The parties to this quarrel were French, Belgian, Italian or German. The American Bishops whose names have been most frequently shot at during this battle have kept silence. M. l'Abbé Klein did, indeed, translate into French the "Discourses" of Archbishop Ireland. By and by, a French version, compressed and not in all respects accurate, of the "Life of Father Hecker," was given to the world anonymously, with a preface from M. Klein's pen. The influence of these translations was certainly great. Unhappily, also, in passing from an English to a continental medium, phrases and ideas which we understand at home in one sense, and that perfectly innocent, were taken to imply another system, with which they had nothing in common. Belonging to the sphere of practice, they were seized upon by theorists and carried up into the region of dogma; politics were transformed to pure theology; the expedient was termed the absolute; and misunderstandings were multiplied by the fatal French habit which constructs on a basis all but imaginary an edifice wholly hypothetical. For these things Americans are not to blame; and good sense can only shrug its shoulders when logic is employed to refute experience, or to read into Engilsh authors a meaning which is unknown to our cast of thought and is merely metaphysical.

For the extravagances, aberrations, and headlong flights of rhetoric, therefore, in which either of these French parties have chosen to indulge, they alone are responsible. Yet some connected with America, doubtless, were behind the journalists who stirred up a quarrel, in semblance dogmatic or spiritual, though in fact as mundane as politics could make it. Interests were clothed in the garb of principles. Nor were personalities long absent. When the *Univers* took Pope Leo's advice and acknowledged the Republic, a new journal was started, *refractaire* to the backbone, which, with unconscious humor, called itself *La Verité*. In the columns of this newspaper, as of others like it, Americanizers, Jews, and Freemasons are classed together; the abuse of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

logic is cultivated as a fine art; and so amazing are the delusions which it fosters that an Englishman, reading it, cannot be surprised when he is told that, in such an atmosphere, the imposture of Diana Vaughan sprang up to its shameful height. Only those who are well acquainted with this curious kind of journalism,—it is sixty or seventy years old,—can form an idea of the fantastic judgments which it is ever putting forth on men and things.* There has long been indigenous to France an English legend; the time seemed ripe for an American one. We may read it in the pages of M. l'Abbé Charles Maignen, whose pamphlet, entitled "*Le Père Hecker, est-il un Saint?*" gave the signal for an assault which was followed up in all the organs of Legitimism.

Archbishop Ireland, as being loyal to American Democracy, could never be put down nor his credit taken away. But could not the attempt be made to fasten upon him, Archbishop Keane, and Cardinal Gibbons the imputation of unsound doctrine? All these were champions of liberty,—the good old English freedom which has its roots in the Catholic Middle Ages, and is the corner-stone of American institutions. Liberty might be rendered into French as "lawlessness," into Italian as "Liberalism,"—anarchy in conduct, free-thinking in dogma,—and the feat was accomplished. In what did the true Americanism consist? In this, according to the Archbishop of St. Paul, that there is nothing in the Constitution which a Catholic may not accept; that he does not aim at pulling down the smallest part of the edifice set up by Washington and his successors; that he has never dreamt of a political ascendency (were it even possible) which would deprive any citizen, on religious grounds, of his rights; that he is ready to live and die with America and for America. Moreover, with Cardinal Satolli, he recognizes that the Americans are, on the whole, a Christian nation; he respects their virtues; he urges upon his fellow Catholics to rival them in manliness, sobriety, honest public service; and he knows very well how pressing is the need of such exhortation, when the millions of Europe are flung without education or guidance upon the American shore. He does not talk of ideal states and conditions no longer existing around him, but of this Western world in which his lot is cast. If the "young French," or any others, believe that their country is passing into

* See its latest specimen—a model of reasoning *à rebours*: "*L'Americanisme et La Conjuration Ant chretienne*," by M. l'Abbe Delassus, *directeur de la Semaine Religieuse de Cambrai*.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a similar phase and stands in need of the like counsels, let them see to it; that is their concern. Nor can he refuse to tell them what methods have succeeded best with him, although fully aware that the Continental nations seldom possess the temper of the men that among ourselves have built up a true religious and social peace. Not a single American has ever thought of dictating to French or Italians their political programme. If there is something in the air favorable to his ideas, he cannot help it; he would not if he could. Suppose the older social conditions of Europe doomed to disappear; shall an American regret their passing? But, in his own mind, Religion is safe; he feels it and he glories in it.

Safe, however, on one condition; it must not seem to endanger the Constitution. Old Protestant hatred still breeds men, neither few nor feeble, who are straining their utmost to abolish the Catholic free schools, to tax their charitable foundations, to ostracize their candidates for office. And these, if they could give momentum to their prejudices by the cry that "Catholics are traitors," would perhaps achieve a good part of their desire. That is why the Bishops in question have maintained, and do maintain, with Hecker and Brownson,—nay, with Cardinal Satolli and the Pope himself,—that, in the words of the Papal delegate, "the State, in so far as it is free and progressive, need fear nothing from the Church; but, on the contrary, ought to expect great benefit from it." And again they insist, as he did in 1893, that "a study of the history of America, the constitutional organization of our Government, and the sentiments of its founders, as expressed in the writings of Washington and our other great men, only confirm the impression that the life and essence of our institutions are in perfect harmony with the sentiments of Leo XIII. on the subject of human liberty."*

Such is the true Americanism. Now for the false. It has been constructed by men like M. Maignen, according to a simple but effective recipe, which consists in taking words apart from their drift and context, reading into them the maximum of false interpretation which they will bear, mingling therewith any extravagances which have been uttered by persons who have no sort of connection with the parties accused, and then crying triumphantly: "Behold the latest plot against Rome!" M. Maignen finds

*Satolli, pp. 75, 218.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that Cardinal Gibbons and Archbishop Ireland express their admiration for Isaac Hecker as an exemplary priest and sound American. It follows, by the rules of his peculiar logic, that they agree in every particle with Hecker's mysticism, to which they make no reference. Cardinal Gibbons, with the assent of his colleagues, the American Archbishops, is present at the Congress of Religions in Chicago, and opens it with prayer. It follows that he is "indifferent" in matters of faith, and holds every religion to be as good as his own. Archbishop Keane reads a philosophical essay on the same occasion, in which he traces the idea of the Incarnation through various imperfect phases in heathen cults, until it is realized and wins the homage of mankind in the Person of Christ. At once he is set down as preaching a monstrous form of "evolution;" he becomes the confederate of a certain "Romanus" whose articles are unknown to him, and whose temper and teaching he would be the first to repudiate. No matter; by dexterous,—or shall we say, unscrupulous?—dovetailing into one of all these scattered elements, an "American" theology is built up, which disowns the supernatural, sacrifices Catholic doctrine to the spirit of the age, and is the harbinger of Antichrist. Having written his book, M. Maignen seeks an Imprimatur from the Cardinal at Paris. Cardinal Richard refuses it. He applies to Father Lepidi, Master of the Sacred Palace in Rome; and Father Lepidi allows his volume, reeking with personal charges against members of the Hierarchy, to appear in the capital of Christendom, armed with his licence.

It was inevitable that Archbishop Keane, who was there on the spot, should protest to the authorities against a defamatory libel. He had suffered already for his Americanism, though it was not mystical, and was simply patriotic. His brilliant career as Rector of Washington University had been brought to an end by machinations of which this is not the place to tell the story. Still, he had not opened his lips in self defence. He now urged upon the Secretary, Cardinal Rampolla, that an Imprimatur to M. Maignen's book, publicly given, should be publicly withdrawn. The Cardinal assured him that it was not his doing, or the Holy Father's; that no one in Rome suspected Mgr. Keane of heterodoxy, and that Father Lepidi had acted on his own judgment. Father Lepidi declared that a licence to print was no approbation; it merely signified that the book did not seem to teach anything

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

contrary to faith or morals. The Archbishop replied that a series of unfounded charges against members of the Episcopate seemed to him *contra bonos mores;* and he insisted that either he was the victim of calumny, or else unfit to be tolerated within the pale of Catholicism. The Imprimatur was not withdrawn.

Two books were now prominently in question,—the French "Life of Father Hecker," with its preface by M. l'Abbé Klein, and the pamphlet issued by M. Maignen, in which, as it seems, had been embodied articles written by M. Peries, formerly a professor at Washington, and not on the best terms with the authorities who had dismissed him. The sum of their contention was that Hecker, and with him all the Americanizers, had fallen into gross heresy on the subject of the inward life and the relation of individuals to the Church; moreover, that they had endeavored to make converts by keeping back essential portions of the creed; that they set the natural virtues above the supernatural; that they upheld, in principle, the separation of Church and State; that they despised religious vows; were bent on overthrowing the religious orders as useless and unsuited to the age; and constituted an extreme and deadly peril to Catholicism, which must be met immediately.

There is much in a name; there is more in an indictment so cunningly fashioned as to alarm many interests and unite their partisans against a supposed enemy. "Americanism" had become a war cry. The Legitimist joined with the Imperialist; some bishops were terror stricken by the defection of a number of priests in France, and by the tactics of M. Charbonnel, who had made a tumultuous exit from the sanctuary; theologians asked whether the mysticism of the "Life of Hecker" was not exaggerated; among the religious orders some believed that their vows were looked down upon and their existence threatened. The Society of Jesus opened fire upon "Liberalism," an ancient enemy; the Dominicans were solicitous for the credit of the Master of the Sacred Palace. There was another palace in Rome, too, that of the Spanish Embassy, whose tenants were not idle. The high Roman society was led by Spaniards, and its tone was violent against America. M. Maignen received a letter of praise from Cardinal Satolli. To a second Cardinal was attributed a *brochure* which did not spare American ideas. The doctrinal campaign was proceeding vigorously in the Latin countries; but while the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Bishops of Nancy and Annecy joined in it, the Archbishops and Cardinal Gibbons, who had been so freely dealt with, held their peace.

It is, perhaps, time to say a word concerning the "Life of Father Hecker," now become the centre of attack. Yet not very many are needed. When the present writer took occasion to review it, on its first appearance in English, in 1892, he certainly did not see in its pages the errors which would have consigned it to penal fires. It then bore the Imprimatur of Archbishop Corrigan. For himself, he thought Isaac Hecker a man of rare simplicity and religious earnestness, who was led on by obedience to the light within, until he had found the Church and submitted himself to it, body and soul. Hecker was German by descent, and mystic by temperament. He wrote a popular style, without the technicalities of the professor, and his meaning must be gathered from the whole of his publications, nor should one part be taken and another left. It is inconceivable that a man who had always on his lips the word "criterion," or touchstone, to designate the Church's function in regard to spiritual experience, can have meant to disown her authority. As little can we imagine that one who was ever telling men to "find the synthesis,"—that is to say, the true union of inward life and outward ordinance,—and pointing to Catholicism as its fulfilment, should have stultified his reasoning and confounded his practice by leaving individuals to follow their private judgment, unchecked by bishop or confessor. Even M. Maignen quotes the aphorism in which he sums up his general rule of conduct; "the Holy Spirit," he declares, "is the immediate guide of the soul in the way of salvation and sanctification; and the criterion or sign that the soul is guided by the Holy Spirit, is its prompt obedience to the authority of the Church."*

Explicit enough, one would say, were any language capable of resisting a malign interpretation. But Hecker's mystical views did not, in any case, attain the publicity, or exert the influence on his fellow-countrymen which some French writers have attributed to them. They were his private opinions, and nothing more. As regards the catch-word "Americanism," though it occurs in the "Life," its origin must be sought elsewhere. It came up, we are told, during the course of that movement, in 1884 and the fol-

*Maignen, p. 111.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lowing years, which was associated with the name of Cahensly. Some German emigrants to the United States,—a section, not the whole of them,—petitioned at Rome for German-speaking Bishops, and demanded a sort of local autonomy, as if meaning to remain separate, they and their children, from the country which had opened its arms to them. There was a great outcry. Archbishop Ireland, pleading for the unity of Church and people, maintained that the newcomers must "Americanize" themselves; and, thanks to his efforts, combined with those of other prelates, and to a strong public opinion, the party of separation was defeated. A German Catholic Church in the States became impossible. But, in the disputes which followed, German critics of the Archbishop retorted upon him the name of "Americanism" as a stigma; nor did they fail to daub it over with inventions of their own. Thus it grew to be an ambiguous formula, patriotic on the lips of those who employed it as a synonymn for loyalty to the Constitution, but redolent of "Liberalism" and all evil things when the extreme German party used it as a weapon of offence. Now, "Liberalism," as understood in Rome, is a false doctrine, anti-Christian and subversive. Nor had Democracy itself, for many years, a grateful sound in the ears of men who sighed for the absolute governments which a Revolution had overthrown. Yet the Church, by her theologians, had affirmed, as did Cardinal Satolli, that "Democracy is the best balancing between authority and liberty."* It could not be laid under anathema. Nor could freedom, or the "civic virtues," or the rights of conscience, or the duty of individual and social development. What, then, could be done by the opponents of Democracy? They could give the name of "Americanism" to a false system of doctrine and implore the Holy See to condemn that. So the name would lose its honor; the tide of democratic progress would be turned back; and between Catholics in the United States and the Constitution a great gulf would be fixed. As in Europe, so in America, there would be citizens holding aloof from State service, or not allowed to share in it, on the ground of their unconquerable hostility to the laws under which they were living. And native Americans would be compelled to remodel their fundamental statutes, or to see in Catholics an alien people and shut them out from office and authority.

*Satolli, p. 260.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Irreconcilables of Europe do not shrink from creating or perpetuating this state of things. They will live and die in opposition, however loudly the Pope may urge them to take their share in public affairs. It is their business to exaggerate, to sow dissension, to shut every avenue which might lead to social peace. For they reason that if things can be brought to their worst, they will mend. Their policy is one of catastrophe and disaster. If Hecker's "Life" had not been given in French, they must have invented some other opportunity for dragging before a church tribunal the democratic leaders whom they feared as well as hated. At the Congress of Fribourg, in 1897, Mgr. O'Connell, an American prelate resident in Rome, published, in a short essay, some observations upon "Americanism, a new idea in the Life of Father Hecker," calling attention, not to any mystical doctrines, but to the character and consequences of American law, as contrasted with the Imperial Roman. He described the flourishing condition of Catholics in the United States, and went on to say that they enjoyed there a form of government at least as favorable to the Church as any on the continent of Europe. These were matters of experience, patent to all. But the Irreconcilables care nothing for experience. They fastened eagerly on the identification suggested between Hecker, the mystic and religious, whom they were assailing, and "Americanism" as a "new idea." Mgr. O'Connell doubtless meant that the idea of liberty, found in our ancient laws, was new to them. But they, transforming politics to theology, drew up their indictment. M. Maignen's book came out in Rome as the manifesto of orthodox France against heretical America.

The parties, we have said, on one side were Imperialists, Spaniards, men of various orders in religion, and good people alarmed by symptoms of change in France, and a general apprehension that infidelity was at the doors. Who were on the other? American Catholics, attached to their Constitution, innocent of dogmatic or mystic novelties, and anxious only to enjoy their Providential freedom. The Pope was called upon, not by them,—for what had they done that could deserve his censure?—but by the alarmists of every shade, who clamored for a pronouncement which, as they intended, should stop the mouth of patriotic Archbishops and make of Democracy a thing forbid. Rumors filled the air. It was said that the French, perhaps even the English,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Life of Hecker," would be pilloried in the *Index;* and then that Pope Leo had reserved the matter to himself; that he was writing a letter which would decide it; that the letter was written and on the point of being despatched. Mgr. O'Connell, after a conversation with Father Lepidi, sent him a brief note in which, distinguishing between the real political Americanism defended by himself at Fribourg, and the figment conjured up by M. Maignen, he affirmed his former conviction, but rejected this new-fangled heresy as despicable. His letter was so given to the world as to make it appear that he had rejected "Americanism" and taken back his argument.

The words which Mgr. O'Connell did write are so much to the purpose that we will venture to translate them. He had said, in his translated letter, "as regards that which people call 'Heckerism,' or religious Americanism, not only have I no concern with it, but I despise it." Three days later, July 14, 1898, he developed this theme as follows: "They (the anti-Americans) talk first of something that they call religious Americanism, the scope of which is to bring into the Church a new phase of religion and dogma, after the fashion of an article written, as is supposed, by an Englishman, who signs himself 'Romanus,' under the heading of 'Liberal Catholicism,' and published in the 'Contemporary Review.' Then they put forward a particular kind of religious subjectivism in all its branches, and call that 'Heckerism.' They will do their best to fasten these two things upon us. Now, I must tell you, Very Reverend Father, for myself, that not only have I nothing to do with anything of the sort, but that I look upon it all as stupid and despicable; and I am convinced that every good Catholic in America would say as much, were he examined on the subject."*

At last, Archbishop Ireland appeared in Rome. It is commonly said that in preparing what was afterwards published by Leo XIII.—the Brief which begins "*Testem benevolentiæ*"—the Holy Father took as his ministers, Cardinal Satolli and Cardinal Mazzella, both of whom had resided in the United States. Equally common is the report that none of the American Hierarchy was called into consultation; while certain French prelates, like Mgr. Turinaz, had expressed themselves emphatically on the subject of Americanism. The Archbishop of St. Paul made his

*Text in Delassus, pp. 304-305.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

protest. He asked to see the text of the letter prepared. But it did not fall under his eyes until it was published in the "*Osservatore Romano.*" Archbishop Keane laid down, in extremely clear language, to Father Lepidi and Cardinal Rampolla, the meaning which he, and those like-minded with him, had always put on the word,—a meaning not doctrinal but political. The chief of the American Episcopate, Cardinal Gibbons, wrote a letter to the Pope which is said greatly to have affected His Holiness, and in that letter the Cardinal denied that any prelate in the United States had held such views as were attributed to some of them during this controversy. When, under such circumstances, the Brief was made public, Cardinal Rampolla assured the Archbishop of St. Paul that it had been so framed as not to touch him; and the Archbishop replied that he wanted no more. Adhesions poured in from every side,—from the Paulist Fathers, Archbishop Keane, M. l'Abbé Klein, and from the Archbishop of New York. The incident was closed without a single defection or the least token of revolt. Let us ask ourselves what is implied in so profound a peace, where heresies had been imputed which, had they had any life in them, must have rent Christendom asunder?

First, it is remarkable that while certain Archbishops and a Roman Cardinal were charged by name with pernicious views in so many journals, none was sent for by the Holy Father, and no explanations were asked of them. Two alternatives, and two only, are therefore conceivable. Either they were so manifestly orthodox that the judgment of the Holy Father did not in any way strike at them; or they were condemned by implication, without a hearing, or any opportunity of defence,—in secret, and on the evidence of avowed enemies. The latter alternative is simply incredible. If there be a writer in Europe who will charge the Supreme Judge of Christendom with conduct so atrocious, we do not envy that man. He is doing his best to stain the memory of Leo XIII. with a moral assassination. But his contention is hollow and false. Where no trial has taken place, no sentence can be pronounced. Cardinal Rampolla's assurances to the prelates in question leave them unscathed and secure. They never taught the amazing errors which need only to be recited in order to be flung contemptuously aside by every Catholic; for, indeed, as Mgr. O'Connell wrote, they are "despicable" in their wanton denial of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

truths, which we have always known, as well as abhorrent to the religious instinct of all of us. Let them go back whence they came, to the Father of Lies.

But, secondly, the Papal document does not condemn Isaac Hecker. It passes no judgment on the "Life." Much has been said and done to twist into a sentence against the man, or his English biography, words most carefully framed so as to rule out of court these unprofitable wranglings. "It is known to you," writes Pope Leo, "that the Book of the Life of I. Hecker,—especially owing to those who have undertaken to translate or interpret the same in a foreign tongue,—has excited not a little controversy, on account of opinions brought in touching the method of the Christian life." That is all. "Opinions brought in,"—by whom or in whose pages, the Pope does not determine. And criticism of the volume would here be quite out of place. For we are required to affirm, not that Hecker said certain things, but that, whoever said them, they are contrary to the Church's teaching;—which we do with all our heart. We may take our own view of the personal and historical question: that which the Holy See insists upon is the doctrinal.

Again, it is manifest that, while expressing their full and unreserved assent to the Papal pronouncement, neither Archbishop Ireland nor Archbishop Keane has retracted one iota of that patriotic and political Americanism, so eloquently proclaimed by Cardinal Satolli when he was Pope Leo's Delegate in Washington, and their constant teaching. Both repudiate the false Americanism made up of errors and extravagances, which, as the Archbishop of New York observes, had endeavored to find a footing under that specious name. And he, too, implies that the word has a proper and lawful use. John Ireland, who has fought so bravely on behalf of a loyal Catholic people, devoted alike to Church and Constitution, is therefore well warranted in exclaiming that "to-day there is light." Not even M. Maignen can henceforth charge the great Archbishop of the West, or his friends and fellow-workers, with errors they denounce and abhor. That they never held them is known, best of all, to every one who has shared their counsels, or seen their daily exertions to plant the Catholic religion in men's hearts, and restore to it the social and civilizing influence which, for the good of mankind, it should ever wield. Leo XIII. affirms the unity of Church and doctrine;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the privileges and services of the religious orders; the supernatural as above the natural; obedience to authority; the need of wise direction; and the claim of Catholicism to be recognized as the one Divine Revelation by individuals and society. It is well. These things have always been dear to the men whom journals calling themselves Christian would associate in a secret alliance with the revolutionary forces of Europe. But, delusions swept away, the prospect of the future lies before us, and it is exceedingly fair.

The nations of the North and South are drawing together; America has a great mission; Democracy is the new track upon which history will pursue its course. The English-speaking races have energy, freedom, science, but also sects and divisions, and need of religious unity. The French and Latin have an unbroken Christian past, the forms and doctrines of the faith; besides art and manners, and a certain beauty of life, as fascinating as it is simple. Will the abounding energy be always separated from the gracious forms? We cannot believe it. The old Religion, the true Religion of Humanity, is indispensable to real progress. Once get rid of the political bugbear, and we are in sight of a great Eirenicon, or message of peace; for under democratic social conditions the Church can flourish, as the home and sanctuary of the Divine Spirit. If we study Pope Leo's encyclicals as a whole, they offer us this hope of reconciliation. Bishops, clergy, laity, religious, all may claim their share in the movement. When we speak of Christendom, we mean the genuine historical Church; in one word, Catholicism; when of Democracy, we mean self-government, as in Washington and Lincoln. It will be to the everlasting honor of prelates like Ireland, Keane and Gibbons, that they have shown the world how they can be at once fervent Catholics and loyal Americans. If that is Americanism, they certainly have Leo. XIII. for their master. They can afford to be misunderstood while their work prospers. But henceforth, though many assail, none will misunderstand them. By their previous efforts the danger of warring Catholic communities in America has been averted; their adhesion to the Papal Letter is but an avowal of what they have always cherished. They may smile now at the Irreconcilables; and who can question that their great Motherland will take them to her heart of hearts? For in the name of America they have undergone a moral martyrdom.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Last of all, the utter quietness with which in the United States the Pope's letter has been received, is no slight argument in favor of those who, like Bishop Horstmann, of Cleveland, have assured the Roman authorities that errors touching the method of the Christian life had not been spread among their clergy or people. Archbishop Ireland repels as a slander the abuse which in Europe has dishonored a noble name; and the fact of so immediate and universal an adhesion speaks for itself. There was no difficulty in assenting, for no article of faith had been denied, nor any laudable practice called in question. And so the Holy Father writes confidently that if, by Americanism, "be meant the doctrines" on which he has animadverted, "can there be a doubt that our Venerable Brethren, the Bishops of America, will repudiate and condemn it as the greatest insult to themselves and all their people?" That is precisely what has come to pass. *Causa finita est.* But there always was, there now is acknowledged by the Pope himself to be, a true Americanism, and it will march to victory under the banner of Leo XIII.

WILLIAM BARRY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

UNIVERSAL PEACE—FROM A WOMAN'S STANDPOINT.

BY BARONESS BERTHA VON SÜTTNER.

I HAVE been requested to write a contribution to these pages with the above title. The subject of Universal Peace occupies my thoughts and actions so completely, and the opportunity of addressing myself to a circle of American readers is so welcome to me, that I was most willing to comply with the wish of the Editor, although I should certainly have chosen another title. For although it is self-evident that everything that a woman writes must be written from a woman's standpoint, it does not agree with my principles to treat the problem of peace and war exclusively, or even principally, in its relations to the feelings and lives of women. Such relations certainly exist, and it will be of great service to the progress of the peace movement if women, as such, will oppose the institution hateful to mothers, and if women's associations (as daily occurs more often) will place the questions of peace and arbitration on the order of the day at their meetings. But I believe that more and more women, who reflect upon this important subject, will leave the specifically feminine standpoint, to judge of this, so eminently the universal concern of humanity, from a more general point of view. It is only too natural that women should hate war, which robs them of the support and the joys of their existence, and for that very reason until to-day this hatred has done nothing towards the struggle against war; on the contrary, only such women as could triumph over their natural feelings of abhorrence, who, putting aside their own grief, could incite to war, or even themselves perform warlike deeds, only such women were brought into prominence by history; only these were praised, because, overcoming their egoism, they had performed their duty by performing brave deeds of sacrifice.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Women who cry, "War must cease because *we* suffer from it, because *we* may lose our dearest by it," these, so long as war was looked upon as natural and serviceable to the fatherland, certainly stood morally lower than those who said: "What matters our misery, the common weal comes first;" or those who bade their sons: "Return home victorious or dead."

Any opposition arising from particular interests, whether it be the interest of rank, class or sex, is deficient in ethical causes, and has therefore also no ethical efficacy. The great influence that women are beginning to exert to-day on questions of social progress, arises from the fact that they have stepped out from their limited sphere of sex, and have learned to judge these questions in their importance to universal humanity. The woman who was capable of becoming an enthusiast for war and joyfully sacrificing to it the supporter of her home and her beloved sons, certainly stood higher than she who was wanting in such powers of sacrifice; but on a far higher level stands the woman who opposes war, not because it threatens *her* home, but because she has comprehended that it is an evil for the whole human race. Not because they are daughters, wives, and mothers, do modern women wish to undermine the institution called war, but they do it because they are the rational moiety of a humanity that is becoming rational, and comprehend that war represents a check to the development of culture, and that from every standpoint—the moral and the economical, the religious and the philosophical—it is harmful and to be condemned. The New Woman alone will work successfully for the abolition of war. The woman of yesterday, in spite of isolated complaints and warnings, did the contrary: she incited silently or aloud to war—silently, by the admiration which she cherished for heroism, and the pleasure which she found in uniforms; aloud, by direct encouragement to fight.

The following episode has been related to me. It was before the Polish insurrection, in the year 1863. In the house of an aristocratic lady the *élite* of Warsaw society were invited to dinner. After the meal, in the smoking-room, the gentlemen were talking over the political situation. The leaders of the subsequent insurrection were among those present. The question was seriously discussed, whether it was possible to enter upon a movement of insurrection with any prospect of success. The conclusion was arrived at that under the existing circumstances such

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a movement would be hopeless, and would only result in bloody massacre and increased severity instead of deliverance, all agreeing that the plans for a rising must be given up, at least for the moment. Nothing was to be said to the ladies of this resolve on returning to the drawing-room, for it would certainly incur their disapproval. One of the gentlemen, however, was faithless to this resolution. He let the secret out. "What! not possible!" cried the women in chorus. "That can only be a jest—no Pole is capable of such cowardice! Who could propose anything so disgraceful?" Of course it was only a jest," agreed the others, who would have found the contempt of the women intolerable, and on the following day the revolution, which resulted so unfortunately for Poland, was set in motion by the same men who had resolved among themselves not to attempt a rising, but who could not endure to displease their wives.

One may presuppose that among the many motives which in the future will work against militarism and war, the following powerful motive will be found: the change in women's favor. When once a higher reward of love is granted to men for the heroic deeds of peace than for those of war, when they know that they will only earn the admiration of the best women by working for the new ideals of justice; and, on the contrary, will arouse the abhorrence of noble women by supporting the system of force, then one of the strongest motives which now drive young men into the profession of arms will be overcome. The true and most important connection between the woman's question and the peace question is this: the realization of the ideals of peace presupposes that the whole of humanity should rise to a higher level than that upon which it now stands in an overwhelming majority. In order that the element of force and oppression, which governs the history of society in the past and in the present, should yield to the element of right and freedom, a higher type of man must be evolved. We are now witnessing this evolution. It is, however, not apparent only in one sphere, but in many at the same time, and especially strongly in the sphere of the women's movement. To the attainment of the ideal towards which modern endeavors are moving, the unimpeded development is necessary of all mental germs in the whole human race. None of the gifts shared by all may be suppressed by reason of supposed unsuitability to the race, or class, or even sex; and the virtues, the larger diffusion of which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is to characterize the new type, must be no longer divided into two halves; gentleness and moderation on the feminine, courage and intellectual power on the masculine, side.

No; every person will have to exhibit these virtues, no matter to which sex one may belong. Just as at the present day there are many common qualities, without which neither woman nor man can lay claim to esteem, such as honesty, cleanliness, diligence, love of truth, sense of duty, in the same manner does the new ideal of perfection exact all human virtues from all human beings at the same time. With the removal of other privileges those of crime must also cease, and man shall no longer pride himself on his excesses. Courage, that model virtue, first of the lion, then of the savage, then of the hero, lastly of the soldier always ready for battle, must lose its halo, and must not be practised only by men to the point of contempt of life, but will be required in hours of danger, in life's difficult situations in a like measure from the perfectly human woman. The human race will not be left alone to the care of woman, but every perfect human being must disdain to be a slave to the pleasure of the senses without love or in treacherous disloyalty. Thus it will happen by the falling of the fetters which one sex has borne so long, that not it alone, but also the other will rise to a higher human dignity. Exactly the contrary will take place of what is dreaded by the opponents of the emancipation of women: the woman will not assume gross masculine defects, the man will not sink into womanish effeminacy, but both united, among them the best, the strongest, and the most intelligent, will form models of a nobler race.

It is unimaginable that a more highly developed cultured humanity, in which both sexes have equal rights in the decisions of society, should uphold the institutions of war. A certain amount of compassion, of sensitive abhorrence of all that is hard and cruel, in a word—of noble humanity, must exist in the cultured community. Men console themselves with the thought that these qualities, so necessary to the existence and dignity of society, are furnished by the feminine sex, and maintain their right to hardness and roughness, a right which is most freely active in war. But when the woman rises to an equal level, must she also become a soldier, and shall she lay aside those virtues which are not compatible with the profession of arms? Shall all gentleness vanish out of the world? That is impossible. Therefore the woman

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

must renounce equal rights. This she will never do; it is much simpler for the man to renounce the profession of arms.

The complete hideousness of unrestrained gross conduct, which passes as permissible and occasionally as quite delightful in the masculine sex, such as drinking, brawling and excess—the complete hideousness of this conduct is plainly visible when one imagines a woman given to such behavior. On the other hand, many weaknesses of character are counted as contemptible in men, and excusable, if not charming, in women—as cowardice, weakness of will, and thoughtlessness. Now, when woman lays aside these "lovely" faults, when she shows energy and self-confidence, some certainly praise her for her *masculine* character, but others at once give utterance to the fear that, with the laying aside of the feminine defects, the feminine virtues will also fall into abeyance. But that is not the case: both sexes must lay aside those faults which disgrace, and practise those virtues which ennoble, humanity.

And now, after protesting against my views being supposed to arise from a specifically feminine standpoint, I will say what I think about universal peace; but first, I should like to give a picture of universal war, as I see it* from the war of the future, so long prophesied and so splendidly prepared.

A war in which all the great military States of Europe took part would surpass all horrors that have hitherto taken place, in the same degree as the present weapons of destruction and those still to be invented surpass the club with which Cain may have slain his brother. In such a war an amount of murder and destruction and savagery would be contained, such as was not in a hundred battles of ancient times. The progress that has been made has not only increased the power of destruction a thousandfold, but also that which is to be destroyed has become a thousand times more valuable, and therefore the injury would be proportionately greater.

The accelerated, incalculable improvement and increase, the technical development that has grown to colossal dimensions, which leads to such fabulous results when directed to the increase of property and happiness, to what equally gigantic results of misery must these not lead, when applied to the principle of the *destruction* of property, happiness, and life: millions of combat-

*See my "*Maschinenzeitalter*." III. *Auflage. Pierson's Verlag.*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ants rush upon one another, and the fighting begins at ever greater distances. Instead of the spear, that only flew a short distance, instead of the later bullet that hit the enemy at a few hundred paces, the death-bringing bombs now whistle through space at a distance of miles; long before the two combatants can see each other the vanguard covers the field. But when and how will the decision take place? "Until one or the other side is so weakened that it gives up the fight." That was in former times the answer to this question. Now both sides rage with equal force. The weakening keeps equal pace. Hundreds of thousands are fallen, but new hundreds of thousands advance, and the decision is not a step nearer. A vanquished, flying army? That exists no more, for no longer are mere armies sent forth, but whole nations. They fight with each other for the sake of a strip of land; but meanwhile the entire land is devastated, depopulated and ravaged on either side. All crops are trodden under foot, all labor suspended, all hearths desolated; one cry of pain from frontier to frontier, and still no decision. Every village a heap of ashes, every field a burial ground, and yet the fight still rages; under the waves of the sea shoot the torpedo boats, to sink mighty steamships; in the clouds rise armed and manned air-balloons against another aëronautic force, and from the height of a thousand feet mutilated warriors shower down in bleeding fragments; mines are sprung and bridges are hurled into the waves with their loads of men, horses and carriages; powder magazines fly into the air; long lines of trains run off the rails; hospitals blaze; and still it is not decided. Army, reserve, militia—the aged, children, women—one after the other is slaughtered; what still lives becomes the prey of famine, of the infallible pestilence, and the war is over. But it is not decided. The tremendous magnitude of the impending war—a magnitude which may be determined with mathematical certainty by reason of the present ever-increasing number of combatants and technique of weapons, might instil a certain admiration and satisfaction, if the love of and rage for fighting had increased in proportion to its means; if the value of human life had sunk in the esteem of the individual in the same degree as in the calculations of material by the administrators of armies; if finally the *gain* of war had increased as much as the inevitable losses. But the reverse of all this is the case. Hatred and love of fighting give place to civilization, growing gentler and constantly

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

spreading; the value of life rises with the embellishments and alleviations afforded by daily advancing progress; and lastly, as regards the advantages of the final victory, a strip of land or a heap of fortress stones, or the absolutely illusory "Fame"—these things, powerless to enrich or to make happy, sink in an ever greater disparity to those sacrifices, increasing to the uttermost, which they render necessary.

So much for the approaching (or, it is to be hoped, not approaching) war. As regards universal peace, which may now not be so remote—for at the present time a conference is assembled in this name, called together by the most powerful military ruler in the world—people are by no means clear as to its foundations and aims. Most persons believe that members of Peace Societies imagine under the name of universal peace a condition of general harmony, a world without fighting or divisions, with undisputed frontiers settled for all time, and inhabited by angelic beings, overflowing with gentleness and love. It is an old custom of the enemies of any movement to represent it in a false light, to attribute absurdities to it which it has never asserted, and then to attack them with cheap sarcasm and obvious refutations. So also here. The friends of peace do not desire to found their kingdom on impossibilities, nor on conditions that might perhaps prevail thousands of years hence, but on the living present and living humanity. The avoidance of all disputes is not demanded—for that is impossible—but that the disputes should be settled henceforward by arbitration instead of by force, as was hitherto the case. This level of culture has already been attained by the individuals of organized states: that it should be attained also by the states themselves in their relations to each other, is the aim and object of the whole peace movement. Thereby one right would certainly be lost—a right which, although it bears the proud name of sovereignty, is in truth a great wrong; the right of one state to attack another. But if ten persons agree among themselves to desist from mutual attack, each exchanges one-tenth of his lost chance of plunder for nine-tenths of assured safety. Immutability of existing frontiers and social arrangements is demanded as little as the avoidance of disputes. For this, too, would be contrary to nature. Obstinacy, bearing the proud title of Conservatism, which opposes all natural alterations and displacements, is itself the cause of all forcible revolt. Just

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as in private life, the individual's possessions are protected from robbery by a civilized commonwealth, but the possessor is not guaranteed for all time, and the poor are not prevented from gaining possessions. Rich and poor families grow or die out, increase or decrease in fortune; new groups are formed, drawn together by natural selection; a growing population must overflow the frontiers; forms of state belonging to a lower level of culture must be supplanted by the civilization of those culturally superior. *Elasticity* is the only quality which ensures peaceful duration or painless and imperceptible transition from one form to another. The world should remember this, now that it has learned the law of evolution, and knows that all life and development is the work of adaptation.

But to contemplate peace and war from a general standpoint is what philosophers and politicians have done from the earliest times. To work out plans and propositions, by which the ruling state of war may be replaced by the establishment of international justice, is a labor which has been carried on systematically for the last ten years by the various groups of the League of Peace, and the inter-parliamentary union. An entire literature already exists on this subject, and by consulting Dr. Evan Darby's "International Tribunal"* and Dr. Benjamin Trueblood's lately published work, "The Federation of the World,"† a complete knowledge of the ideal and practical aims may be gained, as also of the results already acquired.

But now, at the present moment, when the work of peace is placed in the hands of an inter-governmental conference at the Hague, furnished with powers to realize the resolutions passed, it is no longer fitting to draw up theories of the abstract idea of universal peace: now everyone sympathizing with the great cause, and especially such as are in immediate proximity to the conference, are compelled to concentrate all their interest upon it. And, therefore, I will close these lines with a few thoughts, which, quite apart from the "woman's standpoint," might bear the title: "Universal Peace and the Conference at the Hague."

It appears to me that in the criticism and discussion of this unique phenomenon, this unprecedented historical event, the importance of the fact that such a Conference is sitting is too much

*London Peace Society, 47 New Broad Street.
†Boston and New York, Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1899.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

forgotten. One either loses oneself in the question: "What will be discussed?" and subjects every item of the programme to a minute technical criticism, or one enquires: "What will be the result?" and indulges in more or less hopeful, or more or less sceptical, conjectures and prophecies. One forgets to contemplate the overwhelming fact that such a Conference has been called together by an autocrat in our ultra-military times, and in which every State takes part.

Apart from all that will be achieved by speeches, propositions and resolutions, the significance and the effect of the event itself must be of the greatest influence, and the first official Peace Conference appears like a miracle in the history of the world.

Among the many arguments brought against peace movements on the part of sceptics, the most powerful used to be: "What is the use of private exertions?" Rulers will never agree to restrict militarism, which is the support of the throne, or to abolish war, which is the *raison d'être* of militarism. Autocratic Russia itself presented the most serious menace of war. "Suppose you attempt," was the scornful remark, "to get the Tsar upon the list of your societies; then you might speak!" Now, the Tsar stands at the head of all peace movements, but the opponents set aside the circumstance that the most obvious of their ten ordinary arguments has been refuted, and, undismayed, employ the nine remaining ones against the Tsar himself.

People do not only forget to observe the magnitude of such an event as the meeting of an inter-governmental Conference; they also forget, in speaking of the subjects under discussion, to open their eyes to the importance of them. They know what the point in question is, but they do not realize it. Like a person ignorant of music before a symphony of Beethoven, like a three-year-old child before a picture by Raphael, so do people stand before the chronicle of the Conference. They hear and see, but the awe of comprehension does not thrill through them. "Universal Peace!" How few can comprehend the harmony and the glory that lie in these words. How few reflect, while discussing the problems lying before the Conference, *what* is really at stake: the happiness or ruin of themselves and their children! For, that the *régime* of international justice would shower an undreamed-of abundance of moral and material benefits upon the civilized world, and on the other hand, that continued military equipments and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the eventual employment of the increasingly deadly weapons of war *must* lead to ruin and annihilation, can be denied by none. Thus it is nothing less than our highest happiness or deepest misery which is being discussed in the *Huis ten Bosch*. But the world looks on as though it were a question of customs duties or weights and measures; many boast of "being indifferent to the matter." They think thus to prove their superiority, and only show that they do not understand. Not only without but within the Conference is there an uncomprehending majority. Among the delegates, as well as among the Governments that sent them, most are as indifferent, in some cases as hostile, as unintelligent, generally speaking, as the ordinary public towards the idea of universal peace. But that matters nothing: the fact remains that an international parliament is now assembled in the name of this idea; the spirit abiding in the idea, and inspiring the originator as well as a number of the delegates, will exert its power upon the indifferent, the hostile, and the uncomprehending, and will penetrate the world.

The true significance of the Conference is contained in the following words, addressed by the President, von Staal, to the delegates at the opening of the first sitting:

"To seek the most effective means of ensuring to all nations the benefits of a real and lasting peace, that is the chief aim of our deliberations according to the text of the circular of August 24.

"The name 'Peace Conference,' which the instinct of the nations, anticipating the resolution of the Governments, has given to our Assembly, this name well describes the principal object of our labors; the Peace Conference must not be faithless to the mission laid upon it; it must bring forth a tangible result from these deliberations, which is awaited in confidence by all mankind."

All mankind? Not yet. A great portion of it, that which still holds fast to the thousand-year-old institution of war, be it through personal interest or the power of imparted prejudice, hopes that the Conference will produce no result which may endanger war; a still greater portion, the dull masses, expect nothing at all. But those who really have confidence in the progress of culture, who, in agreement with the originator of the Conference and his faithful fellow-workers, are convinced of the necessity of the present ruinous system giving place to another, these latter will note these words of the President of the Conference; and in case of disappointment, in case the Conference were faithless to its

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mission, would raise the demand for fulfilment so loudly and continuously that at length all mankind would be carried away by it.

But such disappointment will not take place. That may be boldly said beforehand. The proposals already put before the Assembly vouch for the earnestness and sincerity of the work which has been begun. They are a proof that the following sentence from Staal's speech is no mere phrase, but the expression of noble resolve:

"Diplomacy, following a universal law, is no longer an art in which personal skill plays the principal part, but is striving to become a science, which must possess fixed rules for the settlement of international conflicts. That is to-day the ideal aim that it must bear in view, and great progress will indubitably be made, if diplomacy succeeds in laying down some of these rules at this Conference. We shall also particularly endeavor to codify the practice of arbitration and mediation. These ideas form, so to speak, the essence of our task, the chief aim of our exertions; 'to prevent conflicts by peaceful means.'"

These words faithfully echo the instructions given by the Tsar to his ambassador. And already much has been done in the specified direction. It is clear that other powers had come to the Conference with plans equally far-reaching if not more so, and the subject of an "International Permanent Tribunal of Arbitration"—this wildest dream of the Utopians—has already been discussed and even in many points unanimously accepted.

The propositions offered by the representatives of Russia, England, Italy and the United States are known through the newspapers. To the opponents of the peace movement that have lately pointed out with special satisfaction that America, that stronghold of efforts for peace, has lately entered military channels, to these the plan sent by the American Government must have caused remarkable stupefaction. With these proposals, with this energetic and open participation in the work of peace, the American will again fill that position in the history of civilization with which the friends of peace in the whole world have always credited him: the Pioneer of peace and freedom.

A tangible result will be produced by the Conference, something newly created, constituted, permanent, that can be developed and expanded. And besides this, a direct result, how many indirect ones? The whole world must now take part in the question, and the various branches of the social organism, the Church, Art, Literature, the Press, are drawn into the service of propagandism. Gifted men like Stead and Bloch, now resident

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at the Hague, have an opportunity of a field worthy of their labors. Stead has prevailed upon a Dutch daily paper to publish an article on "War against War," which plays the same part towards the Conference as the weekly paper for the English, "Crusade of Peace." Bloch is giving lectures, illustrated by views, offering a *resumé* of the great six-volume work in which, supported by dates and facts, he proves that the war of the future is a technical impossibility, an "Utopia." Even if the general public has not comprehended the marvellous significance of the meeting of the Conference, perhaps it will be capable of perceiving the significance of positive results. Facts and successes are always more powerful than the most glorious theories, however irrefutable. And the positive results will be of various kinds. One brings another with it. The question of neutralizing the States, the question of the coalition of neutrals, and lastly the question of disarmament, although the two former are not upon the programme, and the latter seems to have been momentarily put aside —will come to the front. Disarmament and a check to military equipment, these were the chief motives of the Tsar's manifesto. To avert the ruin and misfortune brought upon nations by "armed Peace," was mentioned as the object for which remedies were to be found. When once these remedies—international justice, etc. —have been found, the object can no longer be evaded. I believe that the decision of the Conference upon the question of disarmament will offer a startling resolution, or at least a declaration of principle, which will be binding in the future. One need not fear to be confounded when prophesying agreeable surprises.

Truly, I venture to assert with confidence, the progress from the first of the past eight Peace Congresses in 1889 to the Hague Congress of 1899 has been far longer and more difficult than that leading from this Conference to a complete attainment of its aims; *i. e.*, to the abolition on principle of the institution of war. In the midst of our endeavors for universal peace the Tsar's initiative fell like a bombshell; but now, even were it in the near future, the inauguration of lawfully guaranteed peace would appear to those qualified to judge no longer as a surprise, but as a fulfilment.

BERTHA VON SÜTTNER.

The Hague, June, 1899.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ENGLAND AND THE TRANSVAAL.

BY SYDNEY BROOKS.

THE failure of the Bloemfontein Conference is a disappointment that may prove a tragedy. President Krüger and Sir Alfred Milner, the Governor of Cape Colony, met to discuss the Transvaal question with every external circumstance pointing to a happy issue. The time, the men and the place were all well chosen. In the neat and compact capital of the Orange Free State, the Boer President was among friends of his own race, and the British representative was not among enemies. Both commissioners had behind them the free trust of their respective governments. The President, with the help of his more liberal followers, could have forced upon the conservatives of the Old Boer party any agreement he had cared to sign. It was a good omen, after all these years of obstinate warfare, that he had consented to a meeting at all. It was a better omen that he had declared his willingness to discuss "all, all, all, except the independence of the Transvaal." Sir Alfred Milner, as Lord Cromer's right-hand man during the most arduous years of the reconstruction of Egypt, proved himself second only to his chief in farsightedness, tact, determination and strenuous common-sense; and nothing he has done or said in South Africa has caused the Boers to mistrust him.

The portents of international politics were even more propitious. One may doubt whether there has been since Majuba Hill, whether there is ever likely to be again, any such favorable chance for a peaceful settlement of the great issue of South Africa. To Mr. Chamberlain, the success of the conference meant the restoration of personal credit in a matter that has brought him little but discomfiture. Unquestionably, before risking another rebuff, he must have convinced himself that in a friendly debate lay some hope of getting this troublesome mole-hill finally cleared

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

away, and himself left free to make his mark on English history as the first Colonial Secretary with a policy of his own. The people of Great Britain, still somewhat humiliated by memories of the raid, were never less inclined to be overbearing or more anxious to reach a just and pacific solution. There was nothing in the political situation in Cape Colony but what would quiet President Krüger's suspiciousness and urge him to moderation. His own kinsmen, the Dutch colonists, are there in control of the government, their racial sympathies all on his side, as against forcible interference in the domestic affairs of the Transvaal, their rough business sense counselling justice to the Uitlanders for the good of South African trade. Nothing was to be feared from the masterful empire-builder through whose "keen, unscrupulous course" Great Britain has lost much, even if she has gained more. At the time the conference met, Mr. Rhodes was not even in South Africa. From Germany came no encouragement to obduracy. The Kaiser, indeed, has long since done penance for his telegram, and given the Boers to understand that he can no longer afford to be their friend; and unless everything short of official confirmation is to be disbelieved, the Anglo-German agreement of last summer makes provision for the transfer of Delagoa Bay from Portuguese to British hands, and so cuts off from the Transvaal its last hope of reaching the sea. Even the French who have capital invested in the Rand, have of late put aside their Anglophobia and have been calling upon President Krüger to set his house in order. England and the Transvaal were thus left face to face, with the path towards a reasonable adjustment of their differences made as smooth as possible. That the conference, with all these circumstances in its favor, should have failed, and failed without a step being gained towards harmonious compromise, is a fact that must cause the gravest apprehensions.

The conference broke up over the eternal franchise difficulty, which, while it is certainly the *crux* of the whole dispute, is only one of many points of controversy that will have to be straightened out before long. What is known as the suzerainty question is almost as important and considerably more interesting, because more abstract, and I do not apologize for going backwards a little way into history to get its proper bearings.

When Mr. Gladstone made peace with the Boers, a few

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

weeks after the defeat of Majuba Hill, he restored to them their former independence, subject to the suzerainty of the British Government. This suzerainty was very clearly defined by the second article of the Pretoria Convention of 1881. It consisted of a right to appoint a British Resident, to whom was given a vetoing power over the policy of the Republic towards the Kafirs—a very necessary provision, for the Boers make Deuteronomy their text-book on all native questions; a right to move troops through the State in times of war; and a right to control and conduct all diplomatic intercourse with foreign powers. Some such restrictions were necessary to make the surrender palatable to the British public, but neither Lord Derby, then Colonial Secretary, nor his successors cared much about enforcing them. The Transvaal was held to be a *damnosa hereditas* before the discovery of gold, and the suzerainty clauses were thrown in to save England's face. They did not work well. The Boers chafed under an arrangement that kept them from dealing with the natives in their own way, and disputes became so frequent that Mr. Gladstone proposed a revision of the convention in 1883.

The conference that led to the signing of the London Convention of the following year attracted very little notice. The British public was tired of the whole business. The spirit of Imperialism had not yet descended on the Colonial Office. The Boers badgered and badgered and got almost everything they wanted. All but complete independence was granted them in domestic affairs. The title of Resident was dropped to gratify their susceptibilities, and the British representative at Pretoria became a sort of consul-general on a reduced salary. The word "suzerainty" was omitted as offensive to Boer sentiment. The convention regulated the western boundaries of the Republic and pledged the Boers not to seek an extension of them. It laid an inderdict on slavery or any "apprenticeship partaking of slavery." In one clause only did the British Government assert its external authority. "The South African Republic," says this clause, "will conclude no treaty or engagement with any state or nation other than the Orange Free State, nor with any native tribe to the eastward or westward of the Republic, until the same has been approved by Her Majesty the Queen." This clause again was intended chiefly for home consumption. It was often disregarded by the Boers, and it was not thought important enough to be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pressed home by the Colonial Office. The Transvaal in 1884 was a large but barren tract of ground, barely sufficient for the support of 100,000 stock-raisers. It had but a small connection with British interests. The one clear thing about it to the mind of Downing Street was that it had given England more trouble than it was worth, and that the best thing to do was to leave it alone.

But the finding of gold caused British officialdom to change its attitude with speed. Thousands of Englishmen, Australians and Americans swarmed into Johannesburg, and in a few years converted a bankrupt and disorganized state into the second gold-producing country of the world. The Transvaal and its bewildered burghers woke up to find themselves the centre of European intrigue, and the London Convention was discovered to be a document of capital importance.

It is, I think, clear by the terms of the clauses I have quoted that the South African Republic is not an independent state. Its freedom of action is circumscribed both within and without its own territory. Its boundaries, at any rate on one side, are not only fixed, but fixed immutably. In that direction it is forbidden to expand. It cannot, under the clauses of the convention, introduce slavery, either openly, or in any of the veiled forms under which the institution is still countenanced. Especially, and this is the hinge of the whole convention, is its liberty of negotiation and diplomacy placed under restrictions. Now, no state can be properly called independent which is prohibited from managing its foreign affairs in its own way. The Transvaal is free to arrange treaties with the Orange Free State. With all other countries, as with all native tribes, to the east or west, its relations are ultimately controlled by the British Government. The exact word to describe the position in which the two countries stand to one another is hard to find. "Suzerainty" is a doubtful term of loose application in popular parlance, and of uncertain standing in international law. The word has simply been adopted as a convenient one to define the peculiar relations of England and the Transvaal. To employ it adds nothing to the real efficacy of the convention of 1884; to drop it does not diminish British authority in any way. Call that authority by what name one will—suzerainty, control or the right to veto—the fact remains that the Transvaal, in some most important branches of its national affairs, is finally subject to Great Britain.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The dispute between the two governments over this point is, therefore, at bottom largely verbal and sentimental. Whether the amount of control possessed by Great Britain over the Transvaal constitutes a suzerainty cannot be settled, until we know exactly what a suzerainty is; and that nobody can tell us. The really important thing to know is that so long as President Krüger accepts and acts up to the terms of the London Convention, he is bound to the clause which carries with it the veto of the British Government on all the diplomatic negotiations of the Transvaal, except those connected with the Orange Free State.

It is one thing to believe in the reality of British control, and quite another to approve its necessity. The first is a question of fact, the second of policy and opinion. Great Britain stands committed to the maintenance of the London Convention by the supposed necessities of her position as the paramount power in South Africa; and, after the coquetting between President Krüger and the German Emperor that followed the Jameson raid, the fear of foreign intrigue is too strong for any British ministry at present to allow the Transvaal the same latitude in foreign, as it enjoys in internal, affairs. The fear may seem unreasoning; to many it does seem unreasoning; but, though less potent to-day than it was three years ago, it is still vivid enough to make the preservation of the convention appear a sacred duty and any revision of it a sacrifice of imperial rights. There is room for a good deal of regret that this should be so. The London Convention has attained a quite undeserved and factitious sanctity in the eyes of English people. From seeing their government constantly at work defending it against real or alleged breaches, they have come to think it something very well worth defending. It is spoken and written of as a sort of Magna Charta of British dominion in South Africa, without which Cape Colony, Natal and the whole of Rhodesia would fall a ready prey to some designing power in alliance with the Transvaal. The question of its real value and of the possibility of revising its hasty clauses has never been squarely considered. Yet there is not much, either in its inception or after-history, to command such perfervid adoration. It was hurriedly and carelessly drafted to bring to its quickest end an issue of which everyone was wearied; it was so little thought of that the Boers might claim it has lapsed through frequent unrebuked violations; above all, it dealt with a state of affairs that has altered in every particular

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

since its promulgation. Wherein does its peculiar virtue consist? Most Englishmen would answer, truly enough, in the clause that regulates the external affairs of the Transvaal. But what, after all, is that clause worth? It has irritated and humiliated the Boers without benefiting England in a single essential. It has forced the British Government to an undignified and unproductive watchfulness over the doings of Transvaal emissaries abroad. If it was designed as an effective check on foreign diplomacy, then the intimate approaches of Germany proved its worthlessness to demonstration. It is, of course, impossible to believe that any power that thought it worth while to negotiate a secret treaty with the Transvaal would be deterred from doing so by the London Convention; and equally impossible to imagine that, if any such treaty were to be negotiated, the Transvaal would submit it to the approval of the British Government. The obstacle that keeps foreign nations from intriguing with the Transvaal for the overthrow of British ascendancy in South Africa, is not a fifteen-year-old piece of parchment, but the strength and position of the British Empire; and that strength and position would remain what they are and be a deterrent of undiminished persuasiveness, were the convention cancelled to-morrow. Either there is the possibility of foreign interference in South Africa, or there is not. If there is, the London Convention is no safeguard against it. If there is not, the London Convention, or at any rate its most prominent clause, is superfluous.

As a matter of fact, we know now that neither Germany nor any other power had serious thoughts of taking upon itself the tremendous responsibility of an attempt to oust Great Britain from South Africa. The true danger to the British position comes from quite another source, from the continued want of harmony and confidence between the English and the Dutch, due to the present turbulent condition of the Transvaal. A civil, not a foreign, war is the menace to be dreaded. It is in the power of the Boers to end the uncertainty that paralyzes commerce and provokes racial antagonism and unrest from Cape Town to the Zambesi by reforming their internal administration; and, as an inducement to set about the task, a guarantee of independence would be far more persuasive than the pointed summonses of the Colonial Secretary. It would seem to be at once an act of magnanimity and good policy if the British Government were to renounce its

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

claims to a suzerainty and, if need be, abolish or revise the convention, in return for the grant of those concessions to the Uitlanders which can alone make the Transvaal a contented and friendly state. The Boers are keenly anxious to have their status as a nation placed beyond question. It galls them, as it would gall any high-spirited people, to find themselves, after all these years of struggle, still in a position of semi-dependence. From the British and imperial point of view, there is nothing in the London Convention to compare with the vital obligation of securing justice for the Uitlanders, and inducing the two races to live side by side in peace. Its abolition would involve the surrender of no right of guardianship over British subjects in the Transvaal that the ordinary law of nations does not already secure to the British Government; and the withdrawal of the suzerainty claims, which are an incessant source of bickerings between the two peoples, and bring no real profit to Great Britain, would do more than anything else to reconcile the Boers to an adequate measure of reform. On the bare terms of the London Convention, as a matter of technical legal right, it is more than doubtful whether Mr. Chamberlain is strictly justified in protesting against any of the features of the President's domestic policy. Yet no one can doubt that, had the convention been non-existent, the protests would have flowed in just the same, and possibly with greater force and boldness. The convention, at best, throws but a dubious legality upon a course of action already founded on broad principles of duty and justice. It really hampers, rather than aids, British ministers in their endeavor to transform President Krüger's fascinating mediævalism into something approaching a modern system of government. No sooner are the Uitlanders shackled with fresh fetters, than a brilliant and quite interminable debate springs up between the law officers of the Crown and the legal luminaries employed by Mr. Krüger, as to whether the new imposition is or is not a breach of the convention; the fetters, meanwhile, remaining where they were placed. The net workings of the convention have all along favored the Fabian tactics which the President knows so well how to pursue; and, but for one point, he would probably be quite well satisfied to let it remain as it is. That point is the limitations contained in the convention on the full sovereignty of the Transvaal; and to sweep those restrictions away and place the Republic on an equality with Great Britain, there

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are probably few concessions which he would not be glad to make. There seems at all events to be here an opportunity for an honorable and satisfactory bargain. An independent Transvaal, with the Uitlanders admitted to the franchise, would be no more a menace to the British position in South Africa than is the Orange Free State.

Sir Alfred Milner, of course, went to Bloemfontein with no such heroic proposals in his portfolio. In the present state of England's attachment to the convention, one has to admit that no such proposals are possible. National dignity, pride of possession and fears of foreign interference are too keenly aroused to brook the seeming humiliation of retreat, even from a false and unprofitable position. Too much zeal has been spent on the defence of the convention to make its surrender seem anything but a gross betrayal. Nevertheless, it is worth noting that the conference foundered in part on this very rock. The President proposed that certain of the matters in dispute should be submitted to arbitration. Sir Alfred Milner was obliged to answer, in effect, that on any matter of real importance there could be no arbitration between a suzerain state and its dependency. Such pistolling diplomacy does not make for a peaceful issue. The concessions that will have to be granted to end the veiled warfare that threatens to disrupt the Transvaal and bathe the whole of South Africa in blood, cannot be expected to come from one side only. It is the President's misfortune to have put himself morally in the wrong on almost every point of domestic policy. That does not relieve Great Britain from the obligation of considering whether it would not be an act of mingled wisdom and generosity to make the task of extrication as easy as possible. The renunciation of suzerainty is the only adequate reward in sight that will atone for the comprehensive surrenders required for the reorganization of the Republic's internal economy. It would remove, in great part, the fearfulness of the Boers lest, in yielding to the demands of the Uitlanders, they imperil their own independence; and it would show, as nothing else can, the sincerity and honesty of purpose which animate the English people in their dealings with the Transvaal.

In the Transvaal itself the situation is almost too fantastic for serious presentation. The Uitlanders, seven-eighths of whom belong to the English-speaking race, outnumber the Boers by more

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

than two to one. They own half the land and contribute nineteen-twentieths of the public revenue. It is through their brains and energy that the Transvaal has been raised from bankruptcy into its present prosperity. They are citizens of the most progressive countries in the world, accustomed to self-government and intolerant of any encroachments upon their liberty. The Boers have altered little, if at all, since the days when the Dutch East India Company planted them at the Cape, except to add some of the vices of the nineteenth century to the ignorance of the seventeenth. "In some of the elements of modern civilization," says Mr. Bryce, a witness of inspired impartiality, "they have gone back rather than forward." A half-nomad people, of sullen and unsocial temperament, severed from Europe and its influences for over two hundred years, living rudely and contentedly on the vast, arid holdings where their sheep and cattle are pastured—each man as far as may be from his neighbor—disdaining trade, disdaining agriculture, ignorant to an almost inconceivable degree of ignorance, without music, literature or art, superstitious, grimly religious, they are in all things, except courage and stubbornness of character, the very antithesis of the strangers settled among them. The patriarch Abraham in Wall Street would hardly make an odder contrast. The Uitlanders have an even greater share of the intelligence of the country than of its wealth. Nevertheless, they are kept in complete subjection to their bucolic task-masters. They are not allowed to vote, except for a legislative chamber that cannot legislate; they have no voice in the spending of the money taken from their pockets; they see millions of dollars lavished on the secret service and fortifications at Pretoria, while Johannesburg remains a pest-hole; their language is proscribed in the schools and law-courts of a city where not one man in a thousand speaks anything but English; a clipped and barren dialect, as much beneath pure Dutch as Czechish is beneath Russian, is enthroned in its place; and their children are forced to learn geography and history from Dutch text-books after passing the elementary standards—the President, with a directness that would have come home to the late Mr. Dingley, seeking to popularize his native *taal* by a tax of one hundred per cent. upon foreign books.

It is grotesque to think of Englishmen and Americans being treated in this fashion, and it is quite beyond imagination that they should rest passive in such a house of bondage. The restric-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions on franchise and education fall hardest, not on the capitalists and large mine owners, who are mostly absentees, but on the lawyers, doctors, business men and the working classes who have settled in the Rand district less as a speculation than to make it their home and earn a living and bring up their families. The recent petition from the Uitlanders to the Queen was entirely the work of professional men and laborers. Neither Mr. Rhodes, nor the Chartered Company, nor the capitalists had anything to do with it. It was a genuine and thoughtful protest from the average working immigrant against the intolerable oppression to which he is subjected. Even raids and poets laureate cannot weaken the solidity of these grievances. "Diggers," ventured an Australian Premier, "have no country." That may hold good for Coolgardie and the Klondyke, but not for the Transvaal; for gold-mining in the Rand is less hazardous and uncertain than elsewhere. A payable reef once found, there is little anxiety of its suddenly petering out. Its owner can reckon with some confidence that deep borings will show the same percentage of gold to rock as appears near the surface; and this unique assurance makes it possible to speculate approximately on the duration of the mines. The opinion of the most competent specialists seems to be that the district, as a whole, will not be exhausted for fifty, and possibly not for seventy or eighty, years to come. This puts the Rand on quite a different footing from the gold-fields of Australia and California. The foreigners who have rushed to Johannesburg are, for the most part, genuine settlers, men who look forward to spending their whole lives either in the employment of the mine-owners, or in the ordinary trades and professions that gather round the centre of a great industry. They are not of the order of speculative transients, whose interest in their new resting place ceases with the discovery and exhaustion or sale of a "lucky strike." In other words, they have a country; and that country is the Transvaal; and as men who have taken up a permanent residence in it, they demand, not unreasonably, that it should be made politically and socially endurable.

Before the discovery of gold any settler in the Transvaal could secure the electoral franchise after a residence of two years. The Boers welcomed the money that flowed into the exchequer when the value of the Rand district became known; but they took instant alarm at the stream of capitalists, engineers, traders and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

miners—all speaking the tongue of their hereditary foes—that threatened to overwhelm their independence. To preserve the political *status quo*, they raised the probationary term of qualification for the franchise, first to five years and then to fifteen. In 1890, as a sop to the inevitable clamor for representation, they created a Second Volksraad for the members of which aliens might vote after taking the oath and residing for two years in the country. As the Second Volksraad is not allowed to discuss matters of taxation and as all its decrees are subject to the approval of the First Volksraad—which can legislate without requiring the assent of the inferior chamber—the concession is not worth much. At present no immigrant can vote for the First Volksraad unless he has passed the age of forty and lived for at least fourteen years in the country, after taking the oath and being placed on the government lists, lists on which, according to Mr. Bryce, the local authorities are nowise careful to place him. Even the niggardly reforms proposed by the President at the end of last May were negatived by his burghers. Practically, the Uitlanders are disenfranchised. In every other state, Dutch and English stand on the same equality. In the Transvaal, the English are treated like Kafirs. They have not only taxation without representation, but taxation without police, without sanitation, without schools, without justice, without freedom of the press, without liberty of association. Johannesburg is ill-paved, ill-lighted and abominably deficient in drainage and water-supply, because it is English. The courts of law have been prostituted to the whims of the Legislature, in defiance of the written Constitution of the Republic, that thereby the English might be deprived of their one legal remedy against injustice. Education, except in the Boer *taal*, is forbidden above the third standard, in the hope of forcing the English to unlearn their native tongue. And these indignities are put upon the men who are the source of all the country's prosperity, and its saviours from internal dissolution.

There can be little doubt that, had President Krüger yielded to the demand for the franchise when it was first made, he would have to-day, in the gratitude and contentment of his new citizens, the best guarantee for the independence of the Republic. The suspiciousness and conservatism of the Boer character dictated a policy of refusal and delay and unfulfilled promises, from the effects of which the state has been saved more by the mistakes of its

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

opponents than by the President's own shrewdness. If the existence of the Republic seems to be imperilled to-day, President Krüger has chiefly himself to thank for it. His resistance to a just demand has driven the Uitlanders, by a process common to most political agitations, to put forward other and less reasonable claims. A section of the excluded settlers has started the theory, based on Great Britain's suzerainty, that the taking of the oath of allegiance to the Transvaal does not involve the surrender of British citizenship. If the contention were sound, President Krüger would be well within his rights in refusing the franchise to all such hybrid citizens. But the argument will not hold water for a moment. Mr. Chamberlain and all the best legal authorities in England have condemned and disowned it. A British subject on swearing the oath of allegiance to the South African Republic, or any other state, forfeits at once all his rights of British citizenship, and becomes, suzerainty or no suzerainty, a foreigner. It is a pity a contrary plea was ever urged. It has only served to misrepresent the intentions of the average Uitlanders. As a body, the Uitlanders demand, firstly, such an alteration of the present franchise law as will give them at least an effective minority representation; secondly, permission to educate their children in their own tongue; and thirdly, a rearrangement of the tariff. The present tariff mulcts the whole of Johannesburg for the benefit of a few Boer farmers, and forces the price of the necessities of life to an inordinate figure. Between the omnipotence of a few large capitalists and the fiscal exactions of the Boers, which press as hardly upon Natal, the Orange Free State and Cape Colony as upon Johannesburg, the middle and working classes in the Rand district, in spite of the high rate of wages, are hard put to it to make both ends meet.

The capitalists have grievances of their own, which their enormous influence in a country of poor men has managed to keep well to the front. The nature and continuance of these grievances show to what lengths the distrust felt by the Boers towards the British will carry them, even to the detriment of the national exchequer. The government of the Transvaal has made it its policy to hamper in every way the development of the mines from which the public treasury is filled. A French expert has calculated that better legislation and administration would decrease the cost of production by about thirty per cent. Heavy

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

duties are levied on machinery and chemicals; the tariff more than doubles the price of maize, which is the chief food of the native workmen; and the liquor laws, by making it easy for Kafirs to get drunk, reduce the supply of regular labor and greatly increase the number of accidents. But the loudest complaints are directed against the dynamite and railroad monopolies, from the first of which the state derives not a penny in compensation, and from the second a mere fraction of the sum that goes into the pockets of German and Dutch stockholders. The dynamite monopoly was granted to a German firm some years ago, and securely hedged around by a prohibitive duty on the imported article. The usual consequences have followed. The dynamite is poor in quality and nearly fifty per cent. higher in price than it ought to be. The Netherlands Company, which owns all the railroads in the Transvaal, joins in the merry war of extortion with a series of outrageous freight charges. Taken altogether, these impositions make a difference of three or four per cent. on the dividends of the best mines, threaten the prospect of any dividend on the second best, and make it useless to persevere with those of a still lower grade; the state treasury, of course, suffering in proportion.* One most unwholesome result of this policy is that the rich mines, which can bear the exactions, buy up the poorer ones that cannot, and so tend to bring almost the entire Rand into the hands of two or three capitalists.

It must not be supposed that President Krüger has carried with him the unanimous support even of his own countrymen in making repression the keynote of his policy. There has always been among the Boers a small and liberal minority that favors reforms, and sees in the persistent refusal of the franchise a weapon of offence placed in the hands of their enemies. This minority is still further incensed by the President's importation of Hollanders to fill the government offices, and by his reckless defiance of the Constitution in making the Supreme Court subservient to the Volksraad. Nor have the more enlightened Dutch of Cape Colony and the Orange Free State stood unreservedly on the side of their northern kinsmen. It is true that if any attack were made on the independence of the Transvaal, their racial sympathies might bring them to the support of the Boers; but they are

* I am indebted for these and other facts to Mr. Bryce's "*Impressions of South Africa*," a book the value and thoroughness of which are hardly to be inferred from the modesty of its title.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hardly less desirous than the Uitlanders of seeing the unrest at Johannesburg put an end to. The heavy tariff on wool, wines, brandy and food-stuffs all but closes the richest market in South Africa to their staple exports; and they, like everyone south of the Zambesi, feel the effects of the discontent that radiates from the Transvaal, paralyzing commercial enterprise and development, and wrapping the whole country in a cloud of uncertainties. While opposed to any forcible interference with the domestic affairs of their kinsmen, they have used their influence more than once, but never with much effect, in the direction of peace and moderation. The President's strength lies in the aptitude of his appeals to the spirit and prejudices of the Old Boer party. These stalwart conservatives concentrate all their hatred and contempt for foreign ways and customs upon the British, the only enemies they have known. It was to escape from British rule that their forefathers struck out from the Cape, across the wilderness, and founded a Republic of their own. The incidents of the Great Trek in the thirties, of which the President is the last survivor, are still held in patriotic memory. The British annexed the newborn state under pledges delayed so long that the Boers took up arms to enforce them and won back their old independence. The British stopped the expansion of the Transvaal on the north by occupying Matabeleland and Mashonaland, and on the west by pouncing upon Bechuanaland. It was with British gold, and under the command of British officers, that the raid of 1895 was planned and carried out. Small wonder that the Boers saw and still see in the demand for the franchise only another British plot to rob them of their independence. The Uitlanders had come into the country uninvited and undesired, seeking only gold, and with full warning that it was a Boer Republic they were entering. By what right could these strangers of yesterday claim to be put on a level with the old burghers, who had fought and bled to keep the state free from alien control? And what Boer, looking to the past experiences of his people with the English, could guarantee that their capture of the franchise would not lead to their capture of the entire state, that the Republic would not become an English Republic with an English President, and its original founders a despised and oppressed minority?

It would have been a high achievement in diplomacy if Sir Alfred Milner could have persuaded the President, and through

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

him the Boers, that their fears, if not baseless, are very unlikely to be realized. So long as the reasonable grievances of the Uitlanders are met with an obstinate *non possumus*, the Transvaal runs the risk of perishing suddenly and in violence. The danger can only be avoided by altering the franchise laws to give Johannesburg a voice, not necessarily a preponderating voice, in the government of the country; and by removing the barriers upon the education of English children in English. A revision of the dynamite and railroad monopolies, and a rearrangement of the tariff schedule, would give the capitalists all the privileges they care for, and at the same time add largely to the revenue of the Republic. It is clear that the old suspicious policy of denial and opposition has only endangered the security it was foolishly meant to safeguard. The best hope for the independence of the state must lie in the happiness and contentment of its citizens; and that contentment can only be reached by abolishing racial discriminations and putting British and Boer on an equality before the law. Under a *régime* of frankness and conciliation, the two peoples will be able in time to forget their former animosities and come together in harmony and good-fellowship, as they did in the early days of the American colonies, as they still do in Cape Colony. The newly enfranchised citizens, no more the victims of a mediæval oligarchy, will then be as little tempted to hoist the British flag over Pretoria as the French in Canada to return to their old allegiance. The people of England have no hostility towards the Boers, and no ambition to annex their country. They have, on the contrary, an uncomfortable feeling that, in their clashes with the Transvaal, the British reputation for fair-dealing, which so long as it is deserved is the backbone of the Empire, has not been altogether maintained. They admire the old President's pluck and shrewdness and wish him well in his struggle, even where they have to condemn his methods of carrying it on. They cannot find much in his policy that is defensible except its object, and yet they feel that, were they in his place, they would have done much as he has done; and it is because they are sincere in wishing the Transvaal to outlast the life-time of its rugged champion, that they look to him even at the eleventh hour to overcome prejudice and rebuild his state on the only foundation that has in it the promise of permanence.

SYDNEY BROOKS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

OUR PUBLIC SCHOOLS. A REPLY.

BY MRS. SCHUYLER VAN RENSSELAER.

In an article called "The Curse in Education," published in the May number of this Review, Mrs. Rebecca Harding Davis wrote:

> "Has the public school done its work? Has education been always an unmixed blessing to America and Americans? This question cannot be answered so easily and positively as loyal sons of the Republic may suppose."

On the contrary, a very positive answer to this question is self-evident. No agency devised for the mental and moral improvement of mankind—no system of education, ethical training, or religion—has always, or has ever, done the whole of its purposed work; the results actually achieved by such an agency have never yet been blessings unmixed and unalloyed with evils; and we cannot expect that they will be while men remain men.

We should be unreasonable if we applied an absolutely ideal test to our public school system. But, on the other hand, we need not pause to judge it by the lowest practical test. That is, we need not marshal all available facts and arguments, and then discuss whether the public school has done America more good or harm. Indisputably, the blessings it has bestowed far outweigh the curses. If we try to fancy what the condition of our land as a whole would be if it had had no free schools, the imagination shrinks from the first outlines of the picture. And if any city or district be individually considered, no really valid exceptions to the general rule will be found.

Mrs. Davis wrote of an Acadian settlement in Louisiana, as she had seen it fifteen years before—a "lonely corner" where, with "no railways, no school houses, no politics, and no newspapers," the people, few of whom could even read and write, were singularly

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

good and happy; and she deplored the position taken by a lecturer at the North, who urged that schoolmasters should be sent to this idyllic village, "to open the way for railways, business, and civilization." If such a community could have been fenced in with barbed wire and placed under a strict taboo, it might have continued moral and contented without any schooling. But it was not a normal community in our day and land. It was a "survival," an anachronism; and, as such, inevitably destined to change. In other ages, other lands, there have been true gentlefolk who could neither read nor write. Such persons are unthinkable among ourselves; and so is the perpetuation of pastoral ignorance and innocence in any locality. Business and the railroad, politics and the newspaper, cannot be kept from touching any corner that happens still to be lonely in the modern white man's world; and, little as we may like the kind of civilization they sometimes bring with them, it would hardly be improved by the elimination of the schoolmaster.

Mrs. Davis's real contention, however, was that our educational system does not work as well as it might and should. This may be acknowledged. Yet it is dangerous to dwell exclusively upon its defects without indicating how they may be cured. It is dangerous, also, to lay upon the broad back of the public school all the responsibility for conditions that spring from a variety of causes. And there is a growing tendency toward both these mistakes. Mrs. Davis thinks that the school house is a "fetish" in our eyes—that we believe wherever it stands "a life-giving ichor goes out of it, which will conquer not only ignorance but poverty and crime." Perhaps all Americans once felt thus. But now, whatever the faults and the shortcomings of a community, whatever the follies and the sins of its young people, many persons lay the whole blame upon what they call our craze for "over-education." Because of this craze, they tell us, the hill towns and even the valley farms of New England are abandoned to nature or the immigrant, while the sons and daughters of the soil flock to the towns. Because of it, good servants are hard to find even in our largest cities. Because of it, early marriages grow fewer, and simple, strenuous home life is despised. Because of it, our men are becoming insanely ambitious and our women morbidly discontented, the professions are over-crowded, the trades suffer for recruits, and public life is contaminated by the domination of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

unfit. In short, if our school system is still our fetish, we have relapsed into a barbarian way of treating it. We praise and thank it sometimes; but often we beat and spurn it because the rain does not fall, the fish will not bite, or the hunter breaks his leg.

Mrs. Davis is not by any means the first who has pronounced upon an American village such a verdict as she passes on the one that she calls X—. By the clearness of her description I recognize X— as a place in which I lived for six or seven summers as Mrs. Davis's neighbor. But I do not think that its condition is due to the presence of "the three huge school houses and the free library," or even to the fact that they are not as good of their kind as they ought to be. The whaling and coasting trades which once nourished X—, and fostered activity, self-reliance, and intelligence in its inhabitants, are dead; but they were not killed by over-education. Many similar villages exist along our coasts, and those that possess no academies or libraries do not breed a more active or a happier type of man or woman than grey, little, derelict X—. They also are survivals, anachronisms, although in a different sense from the Acadian settlement. They must change or they will perish of dry rot; and, while the school should do more than it now does to help them to change advantageously, other influences must assist in the work.

The reasons why any American community, large or small, dissatisfies the loyal lover of the Republic, or why any class of its inhabitants does not always think and act as sound sense and good morals would prescribe, are very complicated. It is dangerous to exaggerate the share of blame that should be laid upon the public schools, or upon the beliefs they represent, because we may thus be led into one or the other of two opposite errors. We may come to despise our school system, and, therefore, to neglect its improvement if not its maintenance; or we may be tempted to expect too much from it, and, in consequence, to confuse and weaken its proper work by laying upon it burdens that it ought not to bear.

Mrs. Davis's article is, I think, a sign that the first-named danger is a real one. The second is illustrated by the people who, in these latter days, still cry out that the public schools should teach some dogmatic form of religion, or at least that vague and indefinable thing called "undogmatic Christianity," or, at the very least, some formalized code of "Christian morality." To ask this

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is to ignore one of the great principles upon which our State and Federal governments were based. If, as Mrs. Davis says, our grandfathers were more religious than we, nevertheless they were very careful to sever religion from politics, and from those practical matters which they put under the control of the State, leaving to the individual the duty of caring for his own and his children's souls in his home, and through such religious or ethical institutions as he might choose to support. The full liberty in religious belief and practice that the fathers of the Republic thought absolutely essential, cannot be combined with any form of religious instruction controlled or authorized by the State.

Again, there are many persons who declare that the public schools should teach the manual trades. If so, logic demands that they should also teach the professions and the arts, the highest forms of specialized knowledge and the simplest handicrafts—that they should assume the whole work of secular education. But even to think of this is to mistake the real reason why our free school exists and is supported by general taxation. It exists primarily for the sake of the State, of society, of the public, not for the sake of the individual child as such. It is bound to teach him such things as are needed to fit him for active and honorable life in the Republic, but not, specifically and completely, such as may be desirable to prepare him for the conduct of his personal career. And even in fitting him for life in the broader sense, it demands the intelligent co-operation of the home and of professedly ethical institutions. If it does not get this, its own work will be hampered; the home, now considered the foundation-stone of society, will lose its value by abdicating its influence over the young, and thus losing its cohesion and stability; and the churches will deserve to be abolished as cumberers of the ground. Of course, no system of education, although avowedly and necessarily based upon what Mrs. Davis calls "book learning," is sensible which confines itself to the information drawn from the printed page; and no kind of secular education is good which cultivates nothing except the mind. Yet there is a valid distinction between courses of training for the mind, for the body, and for the conscience, heart, and soul; and some specialization in the manner of giving them is needful, unless—borrowing certain ideas from the ancient Spartan, and some from the modern socialist—we think that the State should have absolute control of every child, from a very early age

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

until he is started upon a self-supporting adult career. Unless we think thus, it behooves us to see that the State does not infringe, within its schools, upon the rights of the family and the church, or weaken the feeling of the child that he must in great part depend upon himself for practical success in life; and, on the other hand, it behooves us to strengthen the school by seeing that other educational agencies do their own work well, and that the efforts of all are harmonized and correlated.

I have acknowledged that our school system, even within its proper province, does not educate our children as well as it might and should. The pleasantest and, I think, the most instructive way to point out some of its deficiencies will be to indicate the directions in which it is being improved. Of course, I cannot speak of it as a whole—as the school system of the United States; there are too many differences, in school law and school practice, between one State and another, and between the towns in each. So I shall speak chiefly of one portion of the City of New York—the Borough of Manhattan and the Bronx, which, long a laggard with regard to the improvement of its school system, is now trying to bring it abreast with the foremost in the land. These, I may pause to explain, are no longer, generally speaking, to be found in New England. There are good schools and school systems in New England; but the Middle West is now our educational leader.

One hopeful sign to be noted in New York is the improvement of the sanitary condition of the school house—the closer and more intelligent attention paid to cleanliness, lighting, heating, ventilation, plumbing, and the care of the children's out-door clothing. Another such sign is the effort to accommodate every child who may ask for a seat in the schools. And a third is the effort to bring into them all the children who now neglect the opportunities they offer—to deal helpfully with truants, to prevent the withdrawal of pupils before they finish the legally prescribed term of attendance, and to induce them to remain for still longer periods.

Here I may cite a few figures.

The average age of graduation from the primary schools of Manhattan and the Bronx was recently computed to be 10 years and 8 months; and, in April, 1899, their registers showed the names of 131,366 children. In the grammar schools the average

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

age of graduation was found to be 14 years, 9½ months, and their register showed 90,511 names. Buffalo is another city with a large foreign population that needs to be Americanized as well as instructed, and here the falling off in attendance long before the school course has been completed is even greater than in New York. In October, 1897, 37,884 pupils were enrolled in the primary grades of the Buffalo public schools, less than half this number—16,380—in their grammar grades, and only 2,494 in the high schools.

Again, in Newark, New Jersey, in October, 1898, the registers of the public schools showed 6,382 children enrolled in their lowest primary grade, as against 965 in their highest grammar grade, (from which the average age of graduation is 14 years, 8½ months), while the senior class of the high school contained 110 pupils, and the total enrollment in the classes of the normal school was 98. And in the schools of Flushing, Long Island, a town of about 10,000 inhabitants (now a part of the Greater New York), the primary departments recently contained 826 children, and the grammar departments 450, while there were 160 pupils in the High School.

These figures ought to soothe the breasts of the people who say that we are "over-educating the children of the poor," and that State instruction should be merely of an elementary kind; and they certainly show that, in our cities at all events, "over-education" cannot be responsible for many of the evils so often laid to its account. But they are figures that excite regret and alarm in the minds of those who believe in a general need for true education, as distinguished from elementary instruction; and also of those who realize that the public school of to-day must train its teachers of to-morrow. Neither in right nor in wisdom can the State assume that private enterprise will supply it with a teaching force sufficient in numbers and adequately prepared. I need hardly say that a great deal more than an elementary education must be given to the men and women who are to instruct our children even in the most elementary branches, and to help to train them during the most impressionable years of their lives. And if it be true, as Mrs. Davis says, that "New England is filled with women competent to teach, standing in rows waiting for a vacancy," nothing of the sort is true in New York City. Here the demand just now is greater than the supply, although during the past year unusual efforts have been made to meet it.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is well indeed that high schools have recently been established in New York, standing midway between the grammar schools and the free colleges, lengthening the term of school life, and solidifying, while extending, the advantages it offers.

At the other end of the line from these, we find in Manhattan recently established kindergartens which are being rapidly increased in numbers. For the little children of the very poor, whose home training is deficient and whose playrooms are the streets, they are priceless blessings. And they do much more than merely shelter these children in their earliest years. They stretch their hands into the home, as the schools for older children cannot so easily do, and bring it into closer relationship with the school; and they emphasize the truths that something more than book instruction must be given, if even this is to be successful, and that something more than the mind must be trained, if even this is to be properly developed.

The fact that a recognition of these great truths has spread through our whole school system, is partly due to the influence of the "kindergarten spirit"—of the educational ideas upon which the sub-primary department is based. "The whole boy should be put to school." "Character building is the task of the school." These are relatively novel precepts, yet they have already become hackneyed by much iteration. They mean that, while secular knowledge must remain the school's chief aim, and "book learning" its chief tool, the body, and the conscience, heart, and soul must be considered as well as the mind, and that right conduct, personal and social, must be taught as well as words and figures, dates and facts. In short, they mean that what Mrs. Davis says ought to be done is at least beginning to be done. Our children are being taught to assimilate and to use their knowledge, as well as to acquire it.

One of the agencies now employed toward this end is physical training—not the mechanical military drill that once seemed likely to grow popular, but is detested by good educators as physically inadequate and sometimes hurtful, and as morally opposed to that true spirit of discipline which means teaching a child to govern himself—but gymnastics and "organized play." There are gymnasiums and roof-playgrounds in the new school buildings of Manhattan, and the law directs that none shall hereafter be built without an adjacent ground-space for open-air exercise.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Another agency for moral and physical as well as mental development is manual training. "Trade teaching and art teaching," cry some, "or, if not this, then evidently a waste of time." Neither the one nor the other. Manual training is not trade teaching or art teaching, any more than instruction in reading and writing is the teaching of authorship. A deft hand, ready to do the mind's bidding, is almost as essential to useful, happy living as an eye acquainted with the conventional signs for transmitting thought. But this is the least part of the gain. To train the hand means to train the powers of the eye, and to bring the muscular and nervous systems into working accord. Some kinds of manual training give the whole body useful exercise. All kinds rest the brain and relieve the body after purely intellectual work, while cultivating them in another fashion and developing the creative instinct. And they teach directness of purpose, concentration of effort, accuracy of observation, and also mental and moral precision and honesty. The teacher, and even the pupil himself, may think that a book lesson has been learned when it has not been, or that an idea has been mastered when it has been only half grasped or wholly misunderstood. But this cannot happen with manual work. A tangible thing is done, and rightly done, or it is not. A stitched seam is straight, a leaf is correctly drawn, a carpenter's joint is true, or it is not. Neither deception nor self-deception is possible in the workshop, and the spirit of accuracy, system, conscientiousness, self-reliance, and helpful co-operation that it develops is carried over into the other class rooms. Moreover, the workshop may cultivate taste as well as skill; and, although it does not teach trades, it celebrates the dignity of manual labor, and often develops individual likings and aptitudes for it. The same is the case with the lessons in "domestic science" given to girls. They are not taught to be "professed" cooks or dressmakers. But their fingers, eyes, and palates are trained; the importance of cleanliness, neatness, order, and exactness is impressed upon them; respect for household work and interest in it are awakened; and these great benefits are augmented by such instruction in hygienic and alimentary laws as could hardly be made to seem practical and important without the help of the cooking-stove.

Again, it is now understood in our schools that the text-book cannot do its work well without the help of other books, and that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

school life should foster a habit of self-instruction, or, at least, a habit of finding rest and recreation in good literature, which will profit the pupil all through his later years. Reference and lending libraries are being established in the schools themselves, and they are being brought into close practical touch with the free libraries of the city.

The influence of the study of nature, as a broadening and a softening moral force, is being more and more clearly seen, and also the fact that it cannot be brought to bear upon our walled-in, cooped-up city children, unless they are enabled to see and to handle, and to watch in their processes of growth, all such natural objects as can possibly be brought into the school-room. And so it is with the divine influence of beauty, although as yet only in a rudimentary degree. The old school houses of Manhattan were frankly ugly, inside and out. The new ones are doing their best to be beautiful, and in many ways reaching this aim. As yet, the school authorities do not attempt to adorn them with pictures and casts. But unofficial friends of the school—notably the Art Committee of the Public Education Association—have begun this work; and they would not lack funds to carry it on more vigorously if the people of New York could only understand the immense educational value of simple and inexpensive but good works of art, not merely in making the school attractive to children that live amid squalid surroundings, but in stimulating their interest in their lessons, and in refining, civilizing, and inspiring their poverty-stricken little souls. It is hard to fancy a child who never sees any pictures, or to guess how his teachers can instruct him in certain branches. Yet there are thousands and thousands of children in New York who see none at all, excepting newspaper cuts, theatre posters, shop advertisements, and the little prints in their school books.

The study of physics, in which much more attention than formerly is now paid to questions of hygiene; the study of history, now understood to be a nursing-ground for intelligent patriotism; the study of civics, in regard to which, of course, the same is true, and even geography, as it deals with the men of other lands, their customs, and their systems of government—all these are agencies for moral as well as mental training. In his Report for 1897-1898, the Superintendent of Education in Buffalo writes that it is now generally acknowledged that a public school should give the young

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"some direct preparation for citizenship;" and his suggestions to teachers are illuminative:

> "Do not be satisfied with merely giving instruction. Try to inculcate a high standard of public duty, the obligation of patriotism and civic pride, a sense of danger to the country arising from official corruption. Show the need of placing public interests above private gain. Insist on the principle that every office exists solely for the benefit of the people and never for an individual or party. . . . The instruction is to be conversational rather than formal."

The same hand writes, again, of the general exercises held daily in all our schools:

> "These exercises should have a clearly marked ethical tendency, and should consist of short talks on current topics, historical and biographical sketches, the reading of choice selections, the recitation of poems, the mention of philanthropic enterprises, simple celebrations of important anniversaries, etc. The design of these exercises is to give children sound and clear notions regarding their duties to God, their country, their neighbors, and themselves."

Thus, the definite teaching of ethics is established in our schools, and in more ways than these quotations indicate, although no formalized moral code is, or ought to be, taught in them. The responsibility for ethical training must lie with the teacher. Text-books cannot do such work, for it must be specially fitted to the needs of the moment and of the individual child. Of course, in the giving of any lesson, individual capacities and temperaments should be considered; and, as Mrs. Davis points out, the greatest difficulty in public education is that it is obliged to "cultivate human souls *en masse*." But, while this fact is more keenly appreciated than it used to be, and the effort to meet it by a greater individualizing of instruction in all branches of knowledge is among our signs of progress, nevertheless it is a peculiarly prominent fact as regards the training of the pupil in right conduct and worthy ideals of conduct. The direct influence of a human personality is the only efficient inculcator of righteousness.

For this reason, especially, it is well that the need for thoroughly qualified public school teachers is more generally recognized than it used to be, and that the meaning of the term is being broadened and deepened. There was a time when "a gift for teaching," what was called "a natural knack with children," added to the possession of good text books, was thought a sufficient endowment at least for a teacher of the elementary branches. Then it was perceived that a teacher ought to be taught how to teach,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and for a time the pendulum swung too far; the desirability of certain innate qualities was forgotten. Now, at last, it is seen that, while a teacher must indeed be made in a very complete sense, while she must not only know books and how to teach their contents, but also must know human nature and child nature, she ought, furthermore, to have certain personal characteristics that may be strengthened into a deep sense of the varied responsibilities of her calling, an intelligent, loving sympathy with childhood, and a profound recognition of the truth that right thinking and not mere book learning, that wisdom and not mere knowledge, is the end and aim of education. For "useful lives and honorable citizenship" our children must be trained, writes the Superintendent whose words I have already quoted. This is the ideal that the school teachers of our country now have set before them. May the home and the church more and more intelligently assist them in a work which the school cannot accomplish single-handed!

The inevitable limitations of the class-room are now recognized by the school authorities; and they are broadening their work in many ways which cannot fail to react happily upon the class-room itself. For example, during the winter of 1898-99 the School Board of Manhattan and the Bronx conducted thirty-one evening schools and four evening high schools in which the instruction was adapted to the needs of adults and of young people forced to work in the day time; and their value to the immigrant is proved by the fact that 4,604 of the pupils who were admitted could not read, while 10,742 required special instruction in the English language. During 1898 the Board also provided for adults, in forty-one school assembly rooms and other halls, 1,595 free evening lectures upon a great variety of interesting and instructive subjects, including the duties of citizenship, and they attracted a total attendance of more than half a million persons, the majority of whom were men of the working classes. During the summer months, the Board conducts vacation schools for its children, in which many useful and entertaining things are taught, but not book-learning of the conventional kind; and it also opens the playgrounds of many of the schools, under intelligent supervision, for more purely recreative purposes. It means to extend its instructions in "organized play" to the little frequenters of the recreation piers, and, if the city authorities permit, of our large parks as well.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And it has granted to the Public Education Association the playgrounds and some of the class rooms in two school houses, to be used on winter evenings by children's clubs.

This last-named work, it is hoped, will spread very widely. It is a presage of the time when the public may be allowed a more general use of the costly buildings that it owns, during the hours when the schools are not in session. And it is one of the signs that, beyond professedly educational circles, a widespread movement to better, to aid, and to supplement our schools has begun.

In Manhattan, this movement is not of more than five years' growth, but it is already vigorous and influential. It shows in that activity of the free libraries to which I have already referred, in the co-operation with the schools of the "Settlements" that are centres of light and of education in the broader sense in many of our poorer districts, and in the close attention that the newspapers, with ever-growing intelligence, now pay to school affairs. It shows, also, in the establishment of such non-professional societies as the Public Education Association, the Kindergarten Association, the Outdoor Recreation League, and the City History Club. The first of these devotes itself wholly to studying the condition and furthering the welfare of the schools, and to keeping the press and the public awake with regard to them. The second started free kindergartens before our school authorities realized the need for them. The third induced these authorities to open the school playgrounds for summer use, and works diligently in many ways for the healthful amusement and physical development of the people. And, it may be added, the Children's Aid Society, with the help of popular subscriptions, established the vacation schools of which the city has now assumed the charge.

These are some of the patent signs that as a whole the people of New York have awakened to the immense importance of the public school, to the fact that the future of the city depends upon it, and to the allied fact that it cannot flourish rightly unless the best thought and the deepest interest of the community are directed upon it. Similar signs may be read in a great many other American cities and towns. And if many rural districts lag behind, they open a fertile field of effort for the summer visitor, who now so often complains of their intellectual and moral shortcomings.

I cannot speak at all of the gradual yet far-reaching improve-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ments that are being wrought in the curriculum of our public schools, and can merely note in passing the happy fact that its methods of discipline are being revolutionized, so that free, cheerful, and almost self-governing companies of children may replace those strictly ruled, physically repressed, and often mentally cowed bands which were formerly the average teacher's ideal of a "well-drilled" class. But I must say a final word from the standpoint of one who, during the past five years, has had a personal acquaintance with the New York public school and, outside its walls, with those classes of the population that most deeply need its help. The more I have studied it, the more distinctly I have come to understand the difficulties with which it has to cope and the way in which it is often isolated in its effort to cope with them, the more clearly I have realized the difference between the average child that it now turns out and the average parent of foreign or even of American birth, the longer I have reflected upon the picture our crowded and polyglot poorer quarters would present if it did not exist—the more I have been impressed, not by its defects but by its merits, not by its failures but by its successes, not by the deficiencies of its teachers but by their unselfish devotion and the educational intelligence they often display, even when their scholastic equipment is not of the best. Any reader who will take the same practical method of inquiring into the question will soon be brought, I think, to agree with me that "a life-giving ichor" does indeed go out of our public schools, even in their present imperfect estate. And, seeing how steadily and rationally they are being improved, he will believe that, while they may never "conquer" ignorance, poverty, and crime, they will win victories greater than any that have yet been won or can yet be foreseen in the ceaseless battle that imperfect humanity must wage against these three terrible foes. Surely it is foolish to lose faith and courage because, in less than a century, the American free school has not done all that the home and the church, active ever since the birth of civilization, have failed to accomplish. But a cautious person may well shrink from predicting what it may do, even within the next hundred years, lest he be accused of airy optimism by those who have fallen into the mistake of blaming popular education for many of the social evils and shortcomings which, in fact and in truth, it is doing more than any other agency to uproot and to cure.

M. G. Van Rensselaer.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE GOVERNMENT OF GREATER NEW YORK.

BY BIRD S. COLER, COMPTROLLER OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK.

THE Greater New York, an experiment in merging nearly one hundred municipal corporations into one harmonious whole, has now reached a stage of progress at which it is possible to discover and correct errors of detail, and to determine with a fair degree of accuracy the present and prospective benefits of consolidation. The final test, which will determine the success of the experiment, will be the establishment of a form of city government that will be more satisfactory to the people as a whole, and less expensive to the taxpayers, than was the administration of public business by the various municipalities that have been consolidated into one. A large majority of the population of the new city do not pay taxes, and they will judge the new order by the general and visible benefits, and the application of local government to themselves and their personal affairs; while, on the other hand, the taxpayers will be influenced in their conclusions by the burden of immediate expense, rather than by the development of conditions that may ultimately affect the value of their property. The disinterested observer and the student of municipal government, however, will look beneath and beyond the unavoidable confusion of the beginning when they come to measure the finished structure.

In determining the question of the success or failure of consolidation comparison cannot be made. The form of the experiment was unique in the creation or building of cities, and the men who made the charter had no precedent to guide them. In preparing a charter for the consolidated city, the commissioners closely followed the general form of government that prevailed in the original city of New York, making such additions and modifications as seemed to them best adapted to the new condi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions. The charter had scarcely gone into operation, however, before it became evident that many mistakes had been made and that changes were essential to the perfection of local government. As was anticipated, the change was an expensive one at the outset, and the cost was increased by acts of questionable legality, which those who created the new city had taken no measures to restrain.

When the act of the Legislature creating the Greater New York became a law, there was an immediate rush on the part of many of the small municipalities that were to be merged into the city to obtain the greatest possible amount of immediate and prospective benefit. Local public improvements, on a scale impossible under the conditions about to pass away, were undertaken, and bonds were hurriedly issued and sold, with complete disregard of consequences, as well as indifference to the prospective rights of the larger city. Extravagant contracts, intended to bind the city for five, ten and even twenty years, were entered upon with no apparent purpose other than to benefit favored local or individual interests. Such methods on the part of town and village officers resulted not only in great confusion at the very beginning of consolidation, but added a large sum to the current expenses of the city, caused higher taxation and left a legacy of costly litigation that may not be ended for ten years. The almost bankrupt condition of Brooklyn and Long Island City and the necessity of temporary loans for meeting current expenses during the year 1898, while adjustment of assessments and taxation was in progress, added materially to the cost of government during the first and second years of consolidation, the money borrowed in 1898 having to be repaid from taxation in 1899. At the outset of consolidation, the combined bond and contract indebtedness of the new city considerably exceeded the constitutional limitation of ten per cent. of the assessed value of real estate, which caused some delay in carrying out projected public improvements, and much criticism and questioning of the wisdom of the step that had been taken. The Greater New York was, to some extent, handicapped at the beginning by a financial condition that might have been wholly avoided by the exercise of better foresight on the part of the framers of the charter. This condition, however, did not at any time seriously affect the credit of the city; and, during the past twelve months, the bonds of the municipality have sold in the open market for higher prices than had been obtained

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for many years for similar securities. To-day the bonds of New York City, considered as investment securities, rank almost as high as those of the National Government. This fact is the best proof that consolidation has not injured the city's credit.

Solvency and credit having been firmly established, official and public attention may now turn, with greater interest, to the details of government, and errors in the plan should be remedied with as little delay as possible, lest they become permanent and serious defects in the structure. In this outline of changes suggested by actual experience of the conditions created by consolidation, it is not intended to criticise the Commissioners who drafted the charter. They planned well, and in many essential features the charter is admirable, and will probably remain without radical change so long as representative government endures. But in detail there is much room for improvement.

The graver mistakes in the plan of government provided by the charter may be classified under two heads:—too much government, and unnecessary division of authority. There are too many departments; too many bureaus and too many officers. Authority should be centralized, responsibility fixed beyond possibility of evasion, details of administration simplified and the machinery of government reduced to the smallest scale consistent with perfect operation. No matter what division may be made of the duties and powers of municipal administration, local government really reaches the people through four channels; police, sanitation, public education and taxation. To the poor and the ignorant, the policeman and the sanitary inspector represent the authority of city government, the public schools the visible benefit of the system. The most direct and economical application of the four chief functions of local rule must, therefore, be best for the people and for the corporation. Directness and economy in the management of the business of the city are possible only through centralization of power and responsibility.

Experience with the government of Greater New York has already demonstrated that cities do not require local legislative bodies. The bicameral Municipal Assembly, created by the charter, should be abolished, and its limited duties divided among the several administrative departments, as a matter of economy, and to expedite the transaction of public business. Only one body should be left with very limited powers, similar to those formerly

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

possessed by the Board of Aldermen in the city of New York prior to consolidation. The creation of a local Legislature, with obstructive power over the appropriation of public money, was in the nature of an experiment in municipal government—or, rather, a revival, under somewhat new conditions, of a plan which experience had frequently proved to be a failure. It was claimed by the advocates of the plan that such an elective body, directly representative of the people, would act as a check upon the Executive and all administrative departments, insure careful investigation and the fullest publicity of all matters affecting the general welfare. In brief, the Assembly was to prevent extravagance and safeguard the rights of the people. The charter provides that all appropriations for current expenses or public improvements shall be approved by both houses of the local Legislature, by a three-fourths vote of all the members. This provision has made it possible for a few members in each house to combine to delay or defeat appropriations necessary to carry on the public business, for no better reason than motives of personal or political interest. The Municipal Assembly, therefore, has developed into a mere obstructive body, with well-nigh unlimited negative power, or at least enough to defeat the best plans of any honest, competent and progressive administration. As a law-making body, this branch of the government need not be considered, because it has made no laws. The hopeless confusion of local legislation resulting from consolidation with ordinances of the former cities of New York and Brooklyn still in force within their respective territorial limits, still persists, and, although nearly two years have elapsed, no effort has been made to bring order out of this chaos. The duties of the Assembly, as fixed by the charter, consist largely of mere details of administration, which should be left to heads of departments and special bureaus. One feature of the business of the local Legislature, however, is worth more than a passing notice. The charter permits the Councilmen and Aldermen to make rules and regulations for the keeping of stands on the sidewalks and stoop lines of the streets. These stands may be used for a great variety of business purposes, and in many cases the privilege is a valuable one amounting in reality to a franchise for the free use of a portion of the public highways. As a matter of business, the city should derive a considerable revenue from this source; the privilege should be a matter of permit and license, a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

simple commercial transaction, carried on through a suitable bureau. The Municipal Assembly has the power, or at least has assumed it, to grant such privileges by resolution; and the keeping of a stand on a street corner has become a matter of political patronage, instead of a business franchise yielding a revenue to the city for the use of public property.

There is, in reality, scarcely any duty devolved upon the local Legislature which could not be discharged by a bureau of some department with profit and advantage to the city, and the powers of this body, as already stated, are largely obstructive. The cost of the Municipal Assembly for the current year is $196,552, and more than half of this amount could be saved to the taxpayers without detriment to the public service. The addition of one or two small bureaus, and an extension of the powers of the Bureau of Licenses, would carry on the work now done by the Assembly, and the privileges given away as personal favors or political rewards could be made to yield a revenue of $500,000 a year.

A second and less expensive experiment was the creation of borough officers, a system that, if carried out to its logical conclusion, would forever maintain sectional divisions, develop and encourage local interests and jealousies, divide authority and responsibility, to a limited extent continue five nominal municipalities within one real one, and defeat the chief purpose of consolidation, if that purpose was to make one great and undivided city within a specified territory. The Charter Commissioners were evidently in doubt as to the wisdom of the plan, because they hesitated and stopped short of placing in the hands of borough presidents and boards actual power to do anything. The office of borough president, instead of being accepted by the public as a place of honor and importance, is regarded rather as an expensive joke on the taxpayers. The possibilities of the plan of subgovernment by boroughs, as outlined in the charter, are too extensive to be considered at length in this paper, but the principle is wrong, if consolidation is to be permanent, successful and satisfactory. If Greater New York is to become the imperial city contemplated by the men who conceived the plan and worked it out with the patience and earnestness of belief in its success, there can be no divided government within its limits, no placing of one section as the rival of another. Divisional lines must be obliterated forever.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The salary of the five borough presidents and their clerks, together with their incidental expenses, amount to $51,300 a year. The sum is not large, considered as an item of the budget, but the city receives absolutely no material result in return. The powers of the borough officers are so limited that a brief repealing clause is all that is necessary to remove this contradictory, useless and confusing attachment of consolidation. The repeal of the chapter of the charter that created borough presidents and boards will save to the taxpayers $51,300 a year, without in the slightest degree disturbing the general plan of government.

The borough system is not only a failure, as a working force in the public system, but experience has not sustained the theory on which the Charter Commissioners were acting when they created borough boards and a city Legislature. That theory was to build around the city treasury on the one hand, and the rights of the people on the other hand, a series of bulwarks or safeguards against possible corruption in office. A public treasury is never protected by an increase of patronage, the cost of which must come out of the funds that are to be guarded. The rights of the people of the city are always safer in the hands of a capable and conscientious Mayor and Comptroller, endowed with ample power carrying with it full responsibility, than they can possibly be when left to the care of a multitude of irresponsible office holders, whose own personal and political interests must of necessity be confined to a district or a borough.

The creation of boroughs, and the accompanying establishment of interior and sectional governments in form, without power, and the installation of a city Legislature were the chief departures or experiments incorporated in the charter. They have both failed so completely that they should be permanently and entirely abolished with as little delay as possible. Various bureaus and offices continued from the plan of government that prevailed in the former cities of New York and Brooklyn are no longer required, and they should be gradually abolished, the nominal duties devolving upon them being divided among other departments. In this way, several hundred thousand dollars a year may be saved in salaries alone. It is not possible, within the limits of this paper, to go into a detailed review of the work of all city departments and bureaus, and point out the particular places that might be abolished; but it has been demonstrated that,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as the government of the consolidated city gets into smooth working order, there can be a gradual reduction of officers that will ultimately result in a large annual saving to the taxpayers.

In addition to the changes in the charter already suggested, amendments should be made in that instrument such as would vest in the Board of Estimate and Apportionment absolute control of the financial interests of the city. The fictitious safeguards of the public treasury having been swept away, as above indicated, centralized, responsible and economical city government would then be in sight. After all, the best safeguard of the money and of the rights of the people is the election to office of honest and capable men. While the civic pride of the New York public may not have reached the ideal in development, it would be preposterous to say that a thief, or even a man of questionable character, could be elected Mayor or Comptroller of the city. With honest executive and financial officers the treasury will be safe, and government can be simplified to a condition where it can be applied to its proper functions without circumlocution, and with such economy as will satisfy the most exacting critic.

The first step towards this ideal condition in Greater New York should be to increase the power of the Mayor, and to fix upon him, beyond possibility of evasion, responsibility for his administration. His power of removal over his subordinates should be absolute throughout his term. The power of the Comptroller over the finances of the city should be extended, so that no claim, not founded in express contract, should be paid, no bonds issued for any purpose and no appropriation authorized without his approval. Such power would serve as an effective check upon the Executive branch of the government. Without money to spend there can be no extravagance.

The next important step should be to enlarge the powers of the Board of Estimate, which, under existing provisions of the charter is called upon to approve every important contract, as well as to regulate the budget and authorize the issue of bonds for all public work. This Board is now composed of the Mayor, the Comptroller and the President of the Council, elective officers, and the Corporation Counsel and the President of the Tax Department, officers appointed by the Mayor. With this membership, the Mayor is the controlling power in the Board. With the votes of the two officers appointed by him he can outvote the other officers

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

elected by the people. The membership should be so changed that a majority of the Board would be composed of officers elected at the polls. This need not hamper the Mayor or curtail his power in any essential particular, and it would satisfy the public to have the control of the city's finances vested in elective rather than appointed officers. The charter should be so amended as to make the Corporation Counsel an elective officer, and thus leave the Board of Estimate with only one member who would be an appointee of the Mayor.

The powers of this Board could be safely enlarged until it became a semi-legislative body. It should have power under the charter, by a unanimous vote of all its members, to build bridges, sell franchises, open new parks, construct public buildings, make and enforce through the proper department any regulation necessary for the public welfare. Its resolutions should be final, and to the routine business of all departments it should be in the nature of a court of last resort. The power of this Board to act in any emergency should be well-nigh unlimited. It should be empowered to control all business affairs of the city without assistance from the State Legislature. The Board of Estimate is in theory, and should be in reality, the Board of Directors of the municipal corporation, with all the duties and powers implied by such a relation to the public business. No act involving the expenditure of city money should require the intervention of the State Legislature, and appeal to the State should be made only in exceptional cases. All public business before the Board of Estimate, or any other board or department of the city government, should at all times be transacted in open sessions. Public hearings should be had on all important questions before a final decision is made, and taxpayers should be invited and encouraged to attend sessions of the Board and to express their views at the hearings. There is never much wrongdoing in the open, and corruption in city government could not escape detection under this system of publicity in the transaction of city business. In addition to compelling honesty, the plan of inviting public scrutiny of everything done would tend to relieve the public mind of possible doubt and suspicion, and would establish a better and more satisfactory relationship between the city officers and the public. A condition of perfect understanding between the governing power and the governed would obviate friction, would en-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sure universal public approval of every movement for the general welfare, and should in time bring about the best system of municipal control that the ingenuity of man can devise.

This condition of open government is possible only by a centralization of authority, as outlined for the Board of Estimate. Heads of departments should have a large measure of control over their subordinates and the minor details of the work they are to do, but in every case they should be the agents of the Board in control of the finances. The Board should have the power to control and prescribe the form of contract specifications, and this power should be exercised in the case of all important contracts.

Another experiment in the charter, the Board of Public Improvements, should be either abolished or modified. The plan for carrying out public work under which this Board was created has some good points and many objectionable ones. Chief among the latter are the extra expense and delays caused by the new system. The cost of the Board of Public Improvements for the current year is $209,500. This entire sum could not be saved to the city by abolishing the Board, because the same work would have to be done by several departments, but there would be a large saving of salaries and much useless red tape would be dispensed with. If the Board of Public Improvements, under the present charter provisions, plans a new bridge, a new small park or any other public improvement the actual work must be done by contract, under the supervision of the Commissioner or engineers of the proper department. Money and time would be saved by having the plans made under the supervision of a head of department in the first place, the plans to be approved and the contract awarded by the Board of Estimate.

The actual receiving, handling and paying out of the city's money are surrounded by such a perfect system of check and responsibility that the theft of any considerable sum is impossible, without collusion between a large number of responsible officials in the offices of the Comptroller, the Mayor and the Chamberlain. The money raised by taxation is paid to the Receiver of Taxes, a bonded officer; by him accounted for to the Comptroller, and then transferred through the Chamberlain's office to the banks and trust companies designated as city depositories. At every stage of transfer, it is guarded by trusted and bonded officers.

No warrant for the payment of city money for any purpose is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

drawn until proper vouchers have passed through the Auditing Bureau of the Finance Department. The system of examination in that bureau is so thorough that a serious fraud could not possibly escape detection. After the vouchers have been approved by the Auditor, the warrants are numbered, registered and checked before they receive the signature of the Comptroller or his deputy. All payments are by warrants on the Chamberlain, who is the city's cashier. The warrants, after being signed by the Comptroller, are carried to the office of the Mayor, where they are checked and where a record of them is entered in a book. They are then signed by the Mayor's confidential clerk, returned to the Comptroller, then transferred to the Chamberlain, who signs a check on a bank, which in case of payrolls passes through the office of the City Paymaster. The amount of money received and paid out every year is largely in excess of $100,000,000. No State, city or private corporation in the world handles as much actual cash in a year as passes through the Finance Department of the city of New York. The fact that no warrant has been lost or stolen, and that no error of any kind has occurred in the handling of the vast sums that have been received and paid out since consolidation, is abundant evidence that the present system of handling the money of the city is well-nigh perfect. There should be a change, however, in one department. Under the present system, the appropriation for the Police Department is paid over in twelve equal instalments. The payrolls of that department do not pass through the Comptroller's office. The Inspectors and Captains act as paymasters for the police. While no thefts or errors have been charged against the department, the system of paying out money should be uniform. The police payrolls should be inspected by the Auditing Bureau, and the money should be paid out by the City Paymaster. With this change, the system of handling the money of the city would be nearly perfect, and the loss or theft of any considerable sum would be impossible.

Another proper step in the direction of centralization and economy would be to reduce the number of Commissioners. There should be a single head for each department. In this matter the charter is not consistent. There are four Police Commissioners and one Fire Commissioner, one Commissioner of Highways and three Commissioners of Docks and Ferries. No person familiar with the business of the city departments would seriously contend

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that one man could not direct the affairs of any one of them. Eleven or twelve commissioners, at $5,000 a year, could be dispensed with at once without detriment to the public service. There should be no divided authority in any department, and then there would be no evasion of responsibility. No department, under the existing system, or the plan herein outlined, can be anything more than a subordinate branch of city government to execute the policy of the administration. Therefore, a voting board in charge of docks, highways or parks is useless and expensive. With absolute authority over the appropriations, and the finances of the city centralized in the Board of Estimate, and unlimited executive power vested in the Mayor, there can be no co-ordinate branch of government, and a board or commission at the head of a working department is, therefore, a palpable absurdity. Exception might be made, however, in the case of the Board of Health, because of the peculiar duties and powers of that department.

The proposed changes in the form of city government would save to the taxpayers almost $1,000,000 in salaries and incidental expenses at the outset, and the centralization of power and simplification of method would lead gradually to other and larger economies.

The amendment and perfection of the charter by the State Legislature, along the lines suggested, would give to the Greater New York a simple, direct and economical form of government, by which the public business could be carried on under the ever watchful guardianship of the people themselves. The officers elected would not be hedged about and restricted by unnecessary forms of law. They would have ample power to plan and execute public work for the public good and for the material advancement of the great municipality committed to their care, and, at the same time, they would be compelled to assume the fullest responsibility for the faithful discharge of the trust reposed in them.

BIRD S. COLER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE RELATION OF THE PRICE OF PIG IRON TO COMMERCIAL PROSPERITY.

BY GEORGE H. HULL.

In the recent enormous advance in the price of pig iron, the people of the United States have another opportunity of studying the cause of such advances, and realizing the controlling and disastrous effect they have upon business of all kinds throughout the entire country. It is well known that this advance is not an unusual occurrence, being only a repetition of what took place in 1854, 1864, 1872, 1880 and 1889. It was not disturbed finances, or loss of confidence, which turned the tide of prosperity in those years. It was the advance of from one hundred to three hundred per cent. in the price of pig iron. The loss of confidence and disturbed finances came months afterwards, and were the effects of the turn in the tide. Each of these advances, and its results, were object lessons, from which we might have learned much, if we had seized the opportunity, while the cause and its effect were passing before us.

The advance of 1899 is a fact of the present moment. It is here, the evidences of it are everywhere around us, and, if history repeat itself, the events which follow its culmination will be a vivid and instructive picture.

Let us study these results and fix permanently in our minds the truths they demonstrate. To do this intelligently, we must first appreciate the importance of iron in this age, and how much more thoroughly it enters into all business advances and improvements, than any other article. It is used in the preparation of the food we eat, in the manufacture of the clothing we wear, and in the building of the houses which shelter us. The pipes which conduct water, gas and other substances under the surface; the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ever-increasing net work of rails which lie on the surface; the vehicles of transportation on land and sea, and the machinery of war and peace, are composed almost entirely of iron. Its consumption is a correct measure of the wealth and civilization of any people. It is the chief element of national growth and power, and each year it becomes more and more necessary to every business enterprise of mankind.

In this paramount dependence of civilized man upon iron, he is but following nature, in whose realm nothing lives, moves or exists without it. It is in the water which bubbles from the earth; it is in every drop of blood which flows through the veins of life; it is in the rocks and soil under our feet, in the vegetation about us, and in the heavens above us. The meteors which fall from the skies are composed almost entirely of iron. It is known to exist in large amounts in the heavenly bodies, and the gases of which iron is composed are found to make up largely the masses of vapor which float in the firmament, and which, by the forces of nature, are solidified into worlds.

The use of iron in the United States is in its infancy. Its consumption is progressing each decade with a cumulative force. Fifty years ago, one hundred pounds were consumed in the United States, annually, for each one of its inhabitants; ten years ago, there were three hundred pounds for each person, and to-day, we are consuming iron at the rate of four hundred pounds yearly for each one of our seventy-five millions of inhabitants.

Whatever restricts the consumption of iron limits, to that extent, the growth of the people in wealth and prosperity.

The wealth of a people consists of the accumulation of what their labor has taken from the earth and fashioned into useful and marketable articles and commodities. With a minimum number of the able-bodied men of the land employed, their combined labor would be barely sufficient to produce what the whole people consumed, and under such conditions there would be no increase in wealth. With every able-bodied man employed, wealth is rapidly and steadily accumulated; every man has some surplus for the comforts and material possessions, as well as for the necessities, of life; and every man is adding to his property, and to the wealth of the nation. This creates the wonderful demand which absorbs everything that can be produced. Every factory, every means of transportation, and every business, are driven to their utmost

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

capacity. The demand is enormous, because the earnings of the whole people are enormous. They cannot get their orders filled as fast as they get the money to pay for them. While this condition exists, the business of the country is on a safe and firm foundation. You cannot over-do such prosperity; it has a safe limit, and that limit is reached when every worker is employed. It is the natural condition of an industrious people: it is, in effect, simply the whole people at work, consuming what they need from day to day, and accumulating the surplus results of their labor, in the form of permanent possessions.

Nothing short of war, pestilence or famine, should check such a condition, and yet without any of these causes, it is invariably checked in this country after a few months' duration. Is it merely a conincidence that this has occurred, in each case, a few months after an abnormal advance in the price of pig iron, or is there some connection between the two? Is one the cause and the other the effect? This is at least a clue—let us follow it. In the centre of growth in this country, iron advanced from nineteen dollars to fifty dollars a ton in 1854; from eighteen dollars to seventy-five dollars in 1864; from thirty-five dollars to sixty dollars in 1872; from twenty dollars to forty-five dollars in 1880; from nine dollars to seventeen dollars in 1889; and iron which was sold a few months ago at six dollars in Alabama, is selling at twelve dollars to-day, with an advancing tendency and a visible supply of but six days' production.

There are thousands of articles produced all over the country in which the price of iron plays so small a part, that their manufacture would continue, whether iron was six dollars or sixty dollars a ton; but the duration of prosperity depends upon the continued growth of the great enterprises, and, in most of them, the price of iron is the chief factor. Many of the enterprises are known to pay but a small revenue upon a normal cost of construction. It is the stoppage, one by one, of such as cannot be continued at famine prices for iron, and the discharge of the workmen employed, which brings a premature end to each of our commercial revivals. This end does not come suddenly, nor does it come at the time when the price of iron advances; consequently, the general public do not connect the two. The cause and the effect are separated by several months. The reason why the important undertakings do not feel the effect and stop, at the time

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the advance in price takes place, is that they have all the material they will require for months ahead contracted for at normal prices. It is when these normal-price contracts are exhausted, and the people who furnish the capital for these undertakings come to face the question of continuing at famine prices for iron, or suspending work until they can resume at reasonable prices, that the fatal blow to prosperity is felt. This comes at a time when there is no lack of money and no lack of confidence; on the contrary, business is at the very height of exhilaration and confidence. With these stoppages comes a curtailment in the consumption of lumber, stone, brick and other materials which follow in the wake of iron consumption; more men are discharged, and the blight has commenced its fatal work.

This turn in the tide is not noticed at first; the community at large is still busy trying to catch up with its orders. We each hear occasionally of some work which has been discontinued, but what we hear makes no impression; we think it an isolated case, if we have time to think of it at all; whereas it is typical of what is taking place quietly all over the country. Soon manufacturers commence to catch up with their orders. There is a lull in the demand. Next, they commence to pile up some of their product, which a few months before they could not turn out fast enough to supply the demand. Next month witnesses a further increase in stock; this goes on until some have more than they can carry. These make an effort to sell, and are surprised to find little or no demand; most concerns have over anticipated their wants, and are more anxious to have their old purchases postponed than they are to make new ones. Finally, some forced sales are made; the prices realized show a heavy decline; this occasions comment; others become anxious about their stocks; the pressure to sell increases; more stocks are forced off; larger reductions in prices are made; the uneasiness grows, and soon there is as great a scramble to sell as there was a few months before to buy.

Prices are soon at a figure that would justify the great enterprises in resuming their extensions, but confidence has gone. The great profits which stimulated these enterprises a few months before, are supplemented by great losses; failures increase; all business takes the alarm, and a panic is the ultimate result.

Whatever is responsible for the stoppage of the great improvements and the discharge of the men employed, is responsible for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

changing a natural condition of prosperity, to an unnatural condition of adversity.

If it is not iron, what is it? There is no other article of importance which is subject to such a condition of inadequate supply or excessive advance in price. It is profitable to carry lumber for seasoning purposes, hence we have a stock of two or three years' production, piled up in every town, city and village; extraordinary demands can be made on this stock without inordinate advances in price. The output of brick and stone can be increased quickly to meet any demand, by increasing the force in the brick yards and stone quarries; buildings can be put up to-day, exclusive of the iron used, at an advance of five to ten per cent. It is not food or clothing; there is no great advance in any of these articles. Pass in review every other article, and you find no such famine and famine prices as take place in pig iron from time to time. The more it is studied, the more one will be impressed with the conviction that the unnatural price attained by iron is the cause which puts a stop to our natural flow of prosperity.

Every great staple, except iron, is either carried in large quantities, or its output can be increased to any desired degree, at short notice; consequently, we have no famine or famine price in the other staples. The average stock of iron carried in the United States, during the last ten years, has been less than twenty-three days' product, and it takes practically a year to build new furnaces. What wonder, then, that as the books of consumers fill up with orders for months ahead, they become alarmed about the supply of iron, and in the scramble that each one makes to get enough to supply his individual wants, the price is carried to enormous figures.

The only remedy for this evil, is to carry an ample supply of iron. This remedy will be supplied in a simple and natural way as soon as the iron men of the country recover from the mistaken idea that a twenty-three days' stock of iron is over-production. It will be hard for the uninitiated to believe that such an idea prevails, but it is a fact. A score of efforts have been made, during the last twenty years, to restrict production. The writer was at the head of one of these efforts in the year 1884, and had no idea, at the time, of what an unwise thing he was attempting.

The iron men of the country who have suffered from these inordinate advances in former years, made a heroic effort to check

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the advance of the last few months; but, with the small stock usually carried in this country, it is not in the power of any man or any number of men to stop these excessive advances. The only possible way to stop them is to have the iron on hand when the country wants it. To attempt to check the advance, by quoting at low figures what you have not got to sell, or to sell at low figures iron to be made in future months, is worse than useless. This does not satisfy the consumer who must have it now.

No sane man in this age would build an engine without a governor, or a rolling mill without a balance wheel; and yet the most important interest of this country is without such a regulator. What we need is a balance wheel to the iron business—some system for accumulating stocks of iron in times of plenty, to be drawn upon in times of great activity. It is of the first importance to this age, and to the generations that are to follow.

How can this be done?

Experience proves that it will not be done by either the producer or the consumer. Each one finds employment for all his money in his legitimate business. In the grocery, drygoods and many other branches of business, the wholesaler and retailer come in between the producer and consumer, and they become the carriers of large stocks; but there is no such middle element in the iron business. Iron goes directly from the producer to the consumer. There is, therefore, no natural medium for carrying large stocks of iron, and no medium can be successfully established, unless it is made profitable to the carrier.

At one time, there was no profitable system for carrying large stocks of grain, cotton, mineral oil, etc., and, during that time, these articles were subject to enormous fluctuations in price. Means of storage existed, but even then the carriage was attended by loss of the cost of storage and interest, and the price of these articles was inordinately low at the time of harvest. Later on, certificates representing these articles came to be dealt in on Exchange; as the dealings in these certificates grew to be large, this carriage, through modern exchange methods, became profitable, and the extreme fluctuations in price were eliminated. The most pronounced instance of this change is found in the price of mineral oil, which fluctuated during the nine years before it was dealt in on Exchange from 52 cents to $7.88 per barrel at the wells, as against a fluctuation of from 64 cents to $1.06 during the nine

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

years after it was dealt in on Exchanges. The largest stock carried during the first period of nine years was five hundred thousand barrels; the average stock, after it was dealt in on Exchanges, was thirty-six million barrels. In other words, before Exchange dealing existed, a stock of five hundred thousand barrels carried the price down to 52 cents; after Exchange dealings were inaugurated, a stock, seventy-two times as large, was easily carried, with 64 cents as the lowest price reached. Could there be a stronger illustration of the beneficial effect of Exchange dealings?

A three weeks' stock of pig iron in the United States during dull times, carries prices below the cost of production. With active dealings in pig iron on Exchanges, a six months' stock could be easily carried, without forcing prices to as low a point.

For thirty years out of the last fifty, the stock carried in Scotland, by Exchange dealing alone, has amounted to more than six months' production, and at one time, for five years in succession, the stock amounted to more than twelve months' production. Great Britain for the last hundred years has been the chief source of the world's iron supply. Hereafter, the United States will be the chief source of supply, and should fortify herself with an ample stock to meet her own and the world's demand. A six months' supply could be easily carried by Exchange dealings; such a stock would prevent the abnormal advances from which the business of the country now suffers, but would not prevent a wholesome advance of from ten to fifteen per cent. Such moderate advances would give great prosperity to the iron manufacturers but would not check the growth of our great enterprises. Our seasons of prosperity would be reckoned by years instead of by months.

There is a general impression on the part of the public that Exchange dealings enlarge the fluctuation in price of the article concerned, but this is totally without foundation. During the summer of 1889, an expert accountant was employed to investigate this question; the different Exchanges gave free access to their books for the purpose; all the general commodities dealt in were investigated, and in every case it was found that the extreme prices reached before they were put on Exchanges had not occurred afterwards. In place of large fluctuations occurring weeks or months apart, there were small fluctuations occurring many times each day, but, as in the case of oil cited above, the extremely low and extremely high prices were eliminated. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fluctuations in the price of pig iron in Scotland, where it has been dealt in on Exchange for fifty years or more, as against its fluctuations in the United States, where it has not been on Exchange until very recently, gives a reliable comparison of the effect of these two conditions.

A forced sale of 20,000 tons in the United States during the last twenty years under normal conditions, would have caused a decline in price of from twenty-five cents to fifty cents a ton; the same amount forced off on the Glasgow Exchange would have caused a decline of perhaps a half penny. On the occasion of a very depressed market, within the last three years, a forced sale of 10,000 tons in the United States caused a decline of two dollars a ton; 30,000 tons were sold on the Scotch Exchange at the same time at a decline of one penny and a half per ton.

There is no lack of capital for the carriage of surplus stocks of iron. Nearly one-quarter of the entire wealth of the United States is represented by certificates dealt in on Exchanges. The amount of new certificates added each year to the Stock Exchange alone is about four hundred millions. A stock sufficient to insure the business of the country against these iron famines, would not absorb one hundredth part of the additional money which goes into certificates each year. The cost of carrying iron is only about one-fourth as much as the cost of carrying grain, cotton, oil and other staples. The former requires only an inexpensive fence in the open air, the latter require expensive elevators, warehouses and tanks.

With active exchange dealings in iron, this country, during the last five years, could have accumulated an ample supply of iron, prices would not have ruled so low during the dull periods, and would not now be so high nor the stock so short as to cramp the business of the country.

In this age, an ample supply of iron, and stability in its price, is second in importance only to a stable government. We may avoid the disasters resulting from a scarcity of money in times of an extraordinary demand by inaugurating a flexible currency system, but we cannot build flexible furnaces.

GEORGE H. HULL.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE LOGIC OF OUR POSITION IN CUBA.

BY AN OFFICER OF THE ARMY OF OCCUPATION.

We want Cuba. It is not necessary to demonstrate the fact that a large majority of our citizens are in favor of adding that island to our territory, and expect that in some way this result will be accomplished. Its annexation will be for its benefit, our benefit and that of the world at large.

But how can annexation be accomplished?

The plain answer is, "only through an affirmative vote of the Cuban people." If we properly interpret American standards of right and justice, our people will not support an administration attempting annexation by force. We can only succeed through the good will of the Cubans themselves.

How can we obtain their good will? Will the Military Occupation effect it?

There are some who are so fatuous as to answer this question in the affirmative. They believe that to the feeling of gratitude which the Cubans owe us for their deliverance from the Spanish tyranny there will be added thankfulness for the reforms we are accomplishing. They believe great quantities of American capital will seek an outlet there, so transforming and enriching the island as to create a desire for Union. They think that by drifting something in our favor is sure to turn up. These people belong to the class whose opinions coincide with their wishes.

None of these hopes is being realized. On the contrary, a feeling of irritation against us is growing up and increasing each day that our occupation continues. In the unsettled state of affairs as to future government, laws and conditions, capitalists avoid the island as though it were a pestilence.

Is it likely that time will bring a solution to these difficulties?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Not while the military control continues. Every day the irritation increases. Every day votes for annexation are lost.

If we hope for the eventual annexation of Cuba, we should at once fix an early date for our withdrawal from the Island, and for the redemption of our pledge to the Cubans and to the world. If necessary, we can ask the Cubans for their opinion about annexation before we go. But, whether we do or not, we will then withdraw with honor; and we shall leave in the hearts of the Cubans a sense of obligation that, added to a community of interests, should some day bring about the union.

II.

"The United States hereby disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction or control over said island, *except for the pacification thereof*, and asserts its determination, when that is accomplished, to leave the government and the control of the island to its people."

This is our solemn pledge. It matters not that it may have been unwise to make it. It matters not if all the nations of the earth should urge us to break it. We must keep it. We have, what few nations have, a national conscience. We must keep our pledges or else our word will be forever valueless, our professions of right doing forever disqualified, our pride in our integrity forever wounded. Cuba is not worth such a price.

There can be no doubt that the "pacification" of the island is now accomplished. City for city, the towns of Cuba are more peaceful and orderly than those of the United States. There never was a more docile, quiet people. When the reorganization of the army was being considered, last December, the chiefs of our army were almost unanimously of the opinion that 50,000 men would be required in Cuba. At present, 12,000 is the number fixed upon by the Government. These troops have practically nothing to do. All reports of "Bandits" are zealously forwarded to the United States by correspondents, and half of them are lies. The country is as quiet, as "pacified," as it ever has been or ever will be. The "pacification" has been "accomplished." It is time for us to "leave."

"But," say some, "if we withdraw our troops there will be anarchy, and we would be responsible to the world for it." It is remarkable how this responsibility, unpledged, seems to cloud the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

other responsibility, pledged by solemn promise. Our responsibility to the world! Are we not responsible for all these petty republics in South and Central America—does not anarchy *rule* them, and do we not say to the world, "Hands off?" Why, then, should our conscience be so troubled about Cuba?

"But," say some, "the Spaniards in Cuba will all have their throats cut." We deceive ourselves. The Spaniards there do not need our help. They are forgetting their hate for Cubans in their overwhelming hate for Americans. And, in their crafty way, they are exciting the suspicions of the Cubans against us. They hope to make common cause with them against us, to force them into an attitude of hostility to us, and, independence once achieved, to throw Cuba, as far as trade relations go, into the arms of Spain. Of course, there may be some Spaniards, red-handed murderers of the awful days of Cuban torture, who are now protected by our arms, and who must, in case of independence, flee the country. We need have no pity for such men.

Looking at the chances of disorder in the Cuban Government from a selfish point of view, we need have no concern. There is a large class of Cubans who say, "We have fought twenty years for independence, and we are determined to have it; but we are afraid we cannot govern ourselves, and, as soon as we find that out, we shall be ready to vote for annexation." A venal government in Cuba in times past, administered by Spaniards, has not kept American money out of Cuba, nor would a venal government administered by Cubans. The failure of the Cubans to govern properly, then, would hasten annexation, as would also their failure to make permanent the reforms our military government is inaugurating in the face of so much opposition.

III.

It is difficult for the average American to understand fully the nature of the irritation caused by our military occupation. In the first place, it must be remembered that we are an alien race. Our methods of thought, of speech, of action are different from theirs. Brusqueness is our characteristic, politeness theirs. We offend them without suspecting it. We ride rough-shod over their prejudices without knowing it.

The officers of our army, generally speaking, in their dealings with the Islanders, have adopted, as far as practicable, the Castil-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ian form of courtesy; but this cannot be said for the men. There is a variety of our *genus homo* who likes nothing better than to show his contempt for a foreigner, especially a "Dago," and there is no question that he has largely taken advantage of his opportunities in Cuba, and is still doing so. The soldier is seen everywhere, in the finest hotels and restaurants. If he wishes to make himself disagreeable, all classes of people are exposed to the annoyance. Insults from the soldiers are fiercely resented by the Cubans, but they say nothing. The matter would be less serious were such things reported to the authorities. They are not, and this is because we are *the successors of the Spanish Army*.

The same reason may be given for the intense fear of our soldiers shown by the Cuban lower classes and rabble. It has one good effect, in that a mob of the largest proportions will at once disperse on the arrival of a few of our burly braves. But it often results in our men escaping the consequences of their misdeeds.

The same fear of the military, born of the Spanish rule, extends to larger matters. For instance, it has been easier for a military commander, desiring to use private property for military purposes, to take possession of it at once, than to look up the owner and the terms. In such a case, the owner might be a long time in making his complaint.

As might be expected, the fact that our officers and men are ignorant of the Spanish language, has not diminished these difficulties. Arguing from the effectiveness and excellence of the military government in the Southern States during the period of reconstruction, it was urged that a military government in Cuba would be most desirable. But in the South our commanders knew the language of the people; they had a multitude of counsellors, good and bad; they understood the civil laws, the methods of raising revenue for the municipalities, and so forth. If they went astray, they were at once apprized of the fact. In Cuba almost none of the military governors speaks the language fluently; few can even read a newspaper. Almost all of the Cubans who speak English are in positions under the United States or in search of such positions, and are likely to color their views so as to make them palatable to Americans. Thus, the difficulties the American commander has in learning and dealing with the situation are vastly increased, and the timidity of the people as to making suggestions leaves him practically in the dark.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

With these drawbacks, there has been no modesty on the part of our military commanders in tackling the problem of civil government. In each province, the civil governor, and in each city, the mayor, is subordinate to the military commander, who has usually a large staff zealous for employment, and the army at his back. Starting with street-cleaning and the control of the police, one by one all the functions of executive government are likely to be taken up, and happy is the civil magistrate who is not forced to acknowledge, as a mayor of an important town recently claimed, that the civil government of his city had become merely a bureau of information for the military governor. Such is the tendency in all the large cities; no matter how good the civil government is, the military commander is in a position to deprive the mayor of much of his authority. The mayor in such a case is liable to say: "Well, if the Americans want to run the city, let them run it," and sulk. The military commander does his best, but, none the less, the city is deprived of the services of a functionary who knows the people, their language, conditions and customs, and in some respects the city must suffer.

There appears to be no limits set, by law or regulation, to this authority to interfere in the civil government, and there is no way in which we can tell how far this interference takes place, in any town garrisoned by troops. As a matter of fact, it is, in a majority of cases, entirely unnecessary; and the best governed cities are likely to be those where this interference is reduced to a minimum.

One reason for this is that the military commander, in his zeal for certain reforms, such as street cleaning, for instance, is likely to forget that there are other functions of the city government which need careful oversight.

The situation is complicated, too, by the poverty of the people, the debts contracted by the cities during the war, the abolition by the military authorities of certain taxes which were sure sources of income, and the failure to substitute others as effective; the robbery of the people by means of franchises granted by the Spaniards, and which are practically continued by the order of the American government that no new franchises should be granted.

A military government at best is a tyranny. The best military government is the one which interferes least with the autonomy of the civil government. Our military government in Cuba,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as a means of *rapprochement* between the two peoples, is a failure. And the extent to which this is the case is indicated by the remark sometimes now heard in Cuba, that, as between the American military control and the Spanish military control, the Spanish was preferable. This remark is an over-statement, begotten of disappointment and chagrin; but it holds a terrible suggestion.

IV.

In pursuing the subject, it is impossible not to look back without regret on our wasted opportunities. In view of our pledge, it was as certain on January first as it is to-day that we could gain annexation only through the will of the Cuban people. What have we done to gain it? What should have been our policy?

The most logical course would seem to have been to give Cuba, as far as commerce is concerned, the rights and privileges of an American State; that is to say, to form with Cuba a customs union; our tariff being applied in Cuba, but with free trade between Cuba and the United States. In a word, we should have appealed to them through their own pockets.

The immediate result of such a policy would have been to increase largely the profits to be derived from Cuban sugar and tobacco. As was the case in Hawaii, large amounts of American capital would have been brought in for investment. Deserted plantations and mills would have been again in operation, and money and work plentiful.

Nothing of this kind was done. The opposition of a few of our tobacco and sugar men seems to have prevented reciprocity. Cuba's tariff and other laws are still Spanish. She still levies a tax on our products, and pays to us taxes on her imports.

In addition, as a result of our military occupation, capital finds the Island in a state of transition; the laws in a state of uncertainty. The ordinary opportunities for investment are absent. And so the plantations remain grass-grown, the sugar mills silent, the wharves rotting and deserted, and the people, poor creatures, with haggard faces, still starving, still asking, "How long, O Lord, how long?" And, worst of all, we who control the destines of the unhappy island cannot answer them. The administration waits for the action of Congress. But it is doubtful if Congress will be more merciful than the administration.

Another thing that would have aided the cause of annexation,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and which so far has received no attention, is the education of the Cubans in the knowledge of our laws and institutions. Judging from their newspapers, the Cubans have but the vaguest ideas of popular government.

Misleading statements regarding the favorable attitude of the Cubans toward annexation are constantly being sent from Cuba to our daily papers. It is difficult, however, for a resident to discover any very strong leaning in that direction. The futility of these statements is shown by the fact that there is not one of the leading newspapers in Cuba which advocates annexation.

V.

To conclude: We are in a false position in Cuba; a position the outcome of which may result in wounding our national pride.

We have the choice of two alternatives: Shall we drift, or shall we decide?

To *decide*; to carry out our promise at once; to take our troops out of Cuba, leaving the people to govern themselves until such time as they may prefer annexation—that seems to be our proper course.

To drift means a struggle with a tremendous problem under disheartening conditions; trying to help this people in the face of daily increasing opposition, ingratitude, irritation, suspicion. It means a postponement of the settlement of problems connected with the material prosperity of the island. It means a failure to fulfill a solemn pledge.

Judging from what we know of the ease with which revolutions are gotten up in Spanish-American countries, to drift may mean eventually a *revolt*.

And, no matter how large or how small a revolt against us in Cuba might be (it often happens that the smallest bands are the most difficult to deal with), no glory would be ours in quelling it, whether we lost in the struggle tens, or thousands, or, like the Spaniards, tens of thousands of men. And it will be time then for the enemies of our Republic to laugh. For the Spanish will seem to have made good their claim that the war of 1898 was one of pure aggression, inspired by the lust for territory.

It is certain that the question of Cuba overshadows in gravity any other question now confronting this country.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE TERCENTENARY OF VELASQUEZ.

BY CHARLES WHIBLEY.

THREE hundred years ago was born at Seville the great painter whom Madrid honors to-day. Nor could the Tercentenary have fallen more opportunely, since at the very present time of defeat it serves to emphasize the imperishable glory of the past. As is suggested in the commemorative verse, composed by the Duke de Rivas, the laurels of war no longer adorn the brow of Spain, but neither time nor reverse can ever rob her of Cervantes, now the whole world's heritage, or of Velasquez, that exquisite master who conferred immortality upon a King of supine will and not undisputed grandeur.

And it is but just that these honorable ceremonies should have been celebrated at Madrid, for though Velasquez was a son of Seville, it was at Madrid that he did his work and established his renown. From the time when, young and unknown, he sought the patronage of the King, he never wavered in his allegiance to the capital, and though the demolition of Joseph Bonaparte long since scattered his ashes to the winds of heaven, it was there in the parish Church of San Juan that he was buried. Moreover, it is not only that you may best admire his works in the Museum of the Prado; the atmosphere and color of Madrid are the atmosphere and color of his pictures. Doubtless the city itself has woefully changed since the painter exhibited his first portrait of the King, the first of so many, to the admiration of the Calle Mayor. But time cannot change a landscape nor utterly deform the plan of an ancient city. The Plaza Mayor is to-day much the same as it was when the Inquisitors discharged their grim duties in its midst, and when Prince Charles sat by the Infanta's side in one of its balconies. The blue sky, too, which hangs above the town is eternally inalterable; the parched Manzanares is still the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

subject of the ancient jest, the Guadarrama wears to-day the same aspect which it wears in the pictures of Velasquez. Here, too, dwelt the Court, whose dignity the painter celebrated, and whose great men, princes and warriors, he set, immortal and distinguished, upon his canvas. Indeed, there was an obvious appropriateness both in the place and the method of the ceremonies; for it is no *fête* of the people which we have witnessed; rather a punctilious court has done honor to a punctilious courtier.

The life of Velasquez is obscured by the veil of mystery, which is commonly drawn over the greatest men. Of his private sentiments we know nothing; if he cherished any theories concerning the practice of his art, they have not come down to us. We can only arrive at his character by negatives, and we are entitled to the belief that he lived for sixty years without exciting envy, or promoting ill-will. He was so far above the others, that envy was disarmed, and he was so happy in the triumph of his art, that there was no room for malice in his brain. Moreover, he was assuredly of a constant temperament, and not even the fealty which he owed his King persuaded him to turn his back upon the disgraced Olivares, first architect of his fortune. His own portrait, which he painted several times, is more eloquent than the records, and reveals to us a true Spaniard, of rare intelligence and native aristocracy. Spanish in dignity, Spanish in pride, Spanish in reserve—such was Velasquez; and this impression, suggested by our scanty knowledge, is heightened by his familiar aspect. The hair brushed wide over his ears, the noble forehead, the strongly-marked eyebrows, the arrogant mouth—these are the tokens of a hero rarely endowed, a hero whom we may worship with humility—who after three centuries still confers glory upon his fatherland, and wins for a country, humiliated in war, the constant respect of the whole world.

But while Velasquez the painter is revealed only in his works, we can follow the career of Velasquez the courtier from the moment when he arrived unfriended in Madrid, until he returned for the last time to the capital, weary and ill. It was his great good fortune—and truly he was fortunate in all things—to win the admiration, the devotion even, of Philip IV. Now, Philip the Great was neither a discreet statesman nor a valiant general. He mounted the throne when the Moors, the wisest blood of Spain, had been driven from the country. He witnessed disaster after

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

disaster with the serene resignation which is still his nation's birthright. Portugal renounced her allegiance; the Catalans revolted with the obstinate independence which has always distinguished them; Naples with no better leader than the madman, Masaniello, threw off the yoke; yet the Spanish King, shorn of his Empire, lost neither his pride nor his grandeur. If he could not triumph in war, he might still be glorious in peace; and so, closing his eyes in characteristic insolence to ruin, he conducted the life of the Court with a grave splendor and serene magnificence which were not equalled even in the France of the Great King. The life of Madrid was not gay, since austerity governed the Monarch, who was never known to laugh; but it was grandiose, and its very fanaticism was informed with a kind of elegance. To this Court, then, Velasquez came, young and untried, nor did he wait long for promotion. The King appointed him instantly his own privileged painter, who alone should be permitted to portray the royal features, and the Prado is all the richer to-day for the King's restriction. Indeed, whatever be said of Philip's rule, it is certain that he was a patron of genius. Under his auspices, all the arts were widely and generously encouraged. The drama of Spain touched its golden age; poets were honored not merely for their sugared sonnets of official compliments. And Velasquez, that he might pursue his craft in peace, was lifted above the necessity of competition; he received a pension, and had his studio in the Alcazar, where the King visited him at his pleasure, and kept his own separate chair; moreover he was promoted with all possible speed; his emoluments were doubled, his dignity increased; now he is appointed Usher of the Court, now he receives the crowning compliment of all, and is styled *Aposentador*, or Lord Chamberlain. Nor were his duties ever humiliating; on the contrary they were such as could best be discharged by an artist; it was for him to arrange pageants, and to design processions, and one can imagine with what admirable skill he grouped the crowds and spaced the soldiers. In his hands truly, the great personages who did honor to King and Court must have become mere details in a vast and splendid composition; and here again Philip displayed a royal wisdom. For once at least in the world's history a supreme artist moved men and women as the materials of a delicate, if transitory, art.

But while the King employed Velasquez for the embellish-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment of his own dignity, he did not forget his favorite's advantages, and treated him, while still under thirty, as the great painter of Spain. When Rubens visited Madrid with all the prestige, not only of his art, but of England, whose emissary he was, Velasquez was deputed to display for his delight the royal treasures. Together, the painters visited the King's Gallery and the Escorial; for once the Spaniard surrendered his privilege, and the Fleming was permitted to paint the portrait of Philip; unhappily the letters which passed between the two are lost, and we are forced to fall back upon the ancient tradition, which declares that they met in reciprocal esteem, and parted without influencing each other. But what a theme is here for an Imaginary Conversation! What a splendid foil for the luxury and magnificence of Rubens must have seemed the sedate tranquillity of Velasquez! And if Rubens had nothing to teach his colleague, at least he persuaded him that Italy was the cradle of the arts; and presently, under the auspices of Philip, Velasquez set forth upon the first of his pilgrimages. How he travelled to Milan with Spinola, whom he afterward made glorious in "*The Lances*;" how he was received everywhere with the respect due to himself and to his King; how he was lodged in the Villa Medici, where he painted his enchanting landscapes; how he turned aside to make the portrait of the Infanta Maria—all these are twice-told tales. And he returned from his journey the same master of style and vision that he set out. Italy quickened his admiration, but left him in the serene possession of himself. Once more in Madrid, he resumed his place at Court, painted the masterpieces, which are now the wonder of Europe, and went not abroad again for nineteen years; then he paid his second visit to Italy, where he collected pictures for the royal gallery, and painted the ever-renowned portrait of Pope Innocent. But when he would have passed over into France, Philip, who was not wont thus to betray the emotion of friendship, recalled him to Spain, and he never approached nearer to the Kingdom of Louis XIV. than the Isle of Pheasants. Here it was that he achieved his last triumph on the world's stage. He designed the splendid *fêtes* which celebrated the betrothal of the Great Monarch to Maria Theresa. The pamphlets of the time give us but a blurred picture of this grandiose spectacle, which imagination is powerless to construct. But no master of the ceremonies ever had a greater occasion for the exercise of his skill. The two monarchs, for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

whom pageantry was a fiercer necessity than conquest, met in amiable rivalry, and it was Velasquez who set the scene and rang up the curtain. But the tedious journey was too severe a strain upon the painter's strength, and he regained Madrid merely to die. His work was done, his fame forever secure, and Spain mourned the loss of her greatest citizen. The King, who masked his feelings as he masked his face, and who witnessed the loss of provinces without a murmur, could not contemplate in silence the loss of his beloved painter. "*Estoy abatido*," "I am cast down," he wrote in the margin of a despatch, and it would be difficult to compose a more eloquent confession of grief.

It is for this reason, then, because he was himself a courtier, that Velasquez was most properly honored in the seclusion of the Court. A *fête de famille*, the journals called it with perhaps a spice of bitterness. And the bitterness is unjustified, since, as has been said, the people of Spain have but a moderate appreciation of Velasquez. In the popular judgment, Murillo is the greater glory of the country. The Court phrase that while Velasquez was the painter of earth, Murillo was the painter of heaven, sufficiently explains the common confusion of idea. It explains also the great master's lofty exclusiveness. But Velasquez was something yet more exclusive than a courtier. He was a Knight of the most noble Order of Santiago, and those who are to-day honored with the uniform which once he wore paid their proper tribute of respect to his memory. Their solemn requiem carried the spectator far back into the past, and showed how closely linked is the great chain of tradition. The Church itself was a noble background—with its green and white walls, and its mysterious grilles, behind which fluttered mysteriously the ghostly sisterhood. Then entered the Knights, robed in white, each bearing on his breast the red cross of the Order, and carrying a lighted candle in his hand. So was conducted a solemn service for the dead, and as the voices of the unseen choir chanted the Mass of Velasquez' own time, as the Archbishop sprinkled the robe of the dead Knight with holy water, you might have been transported yourself to the seventeenth century, a pious witness of the painter's funeral. And the solemnity was enhanced by the reflection that the Order of Santiago, of nobles all composed, was celebrating the august memory of the only Knight who ever wore its cross without a true patent of nobility.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

For rumor says, and if the rumor be not true, at least it is the symbol of truth, that when Velasquez had finished "*Las Meninas*," the King declared that one thing only was needed for its perfection: the cross of Santiago upon the painter's breast; and instantly he demanded this supreme honor for Velasquez. But first the painter was asked to prove his noble birth, and the letter, written with his own hand, wherein he sets forth his genealogy, may to-day be seen in the Museum of the Prado. His genealogy might have been sufficient, and he had no difficulty in declaring that he had never worked for money. When he painted Pope Innocent, he refused reward on the ground that the King his Master paid him sufficiently. "I have never painted," said he in an immortal phrase, "save for my own amusement and to obey my King." Never was there a prouder expression of the artistic conscience; yet it was not enough to satisfy the punctilio of Spain. The forefathers of Velasquez had not been exempt from a certain tax, which the nobility was never asked to pay; wherefore his claim was rejected, and he might only enter the distinguished order by dispensation of the Pope. This dispensation of course was readily granted, and so the Knighthood of to-day was privileged to pay a tribute of respect to its greatest member.

If the King and the Court honored the painter, the painter more than repaid the debt incurred. For he told on his eloquent canvas the whole history of his time. There in the newly-rearranged gallery hang the elegant, distinguished portraits of Kings, Princes, Statesmen, Soldiers, Scholars, Poets and Dwarfs. All that was great and picturesque in the greatest and most picturesque of Courts is portrayed with insight and fidelity. Philip IV. looks gravely out from many a pompous frame. There rides the Conde-Duque, in all the arrogance of untrammelled power, a fitting minister for so ornate a King; there Don Carlos prances on his fat horse, and the demure Fernando contemplates the chase. And there in another corner squat or stand those amazing dwarfs, who made solemn mirth in the sedatest of palaces, with whom Velasquez took his place at the bull-fights of the Plaza Mayor, and who were great enough to inhabit palaces of their own. And there in the centre hangs the glorious "*Lanzas*," exquisite in color, magnificent in arrangement, the noblest epic ever sung of war, wherein you know not which to admire the more ardently, the victor's gesture of loyal compassion, or the proud humility of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

conquered. Thus it is that heroes meet in combat; thus it is that gentlemen accept the ordinance of fate, and as Velasquez has shown in how noble a spirit Spinola endured his triumph, so his countrymen to-day have shown with what a tranquil resignation they can accept defeat. And there in the solitude of a chamber apart smiles *"Las Meninas,"* the supreme glory of the Court, the last triumph of human vision and delicate design. The scene is so intimately realized, that the spectator seems to bear his part in the sumptuous comedy, to stand for an instant within the Alcazar itself. And the divine *"Hilanderas,"* whose work-girls are posed like Greek statues, and the solemn *"Christ,"* and that lofty interpretation of common life, *"Los Borrachos"*—these too are resplendent upon the walls of the Prado. In Madrid then, and in Madrid alone, you may contemplate the real achievement of Velasquez, an achievement which no disaster may diminish, no defeat annihilate.

There are some men whose grandeur cannot be expressed, the beauty of whose work may not be discussed. The most that can be said of them is that they are *there*. There is Shakespeare, there is Velasquez; and Velasquez is the more fortunate, because while photography is his sole dishonor, Shakespeare may be mangled in every barn. The misunderstanding which has overtaken him is unimportant, and passes in a breath. He has been called a realist, and with a perfect injustice. For realism is the vice of the quality—reality; and if Velasquez is always real, never once does he appear realistic. The truth for its own sake meant nothing to him; only he was better skilled than any man that ever lived to detect in truth what is beautiful. While he sojourned in Seville, he informed with dignity the people of the street; when he reached Madrid, he saw in the King's palace whatever was noble and of good report. And he evoked these splendid images, because he was above all a man of his epoch; he did not return to the traditions of the schools or to the worn-out habits of his craft. He belonged to no school; he came from nowhere. He was not the pupil of this man or that—he was himself. He opened a fresh eye upon a magnificent world, and those pictures which he saw he transcribed with a faithful delicacy. When you look at the great works of the great Italians, you feel that they were painted; when you gaze at the masterpieces of Velasquez, you know only that he saw. In other words, his portraits

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are not so much pictures, as veritable personages, but personages purged of failure and stupidity, personages set in such an atmosphere as only a clairvoyant could imagine, and posed with a dignity only possible to a great master of the ceremonies.

Nor is there in his works any suggestion of strain or labor. He does not strive nor cry. An absence of effort characterizes the least of his pictures, and the refinement of his method is so exquisite that the spectator loses even the sense of his material. Palette and brushes are far away, and nought remains but an impression, which seems to have been wafted through the eye to the painter's brain, and then blown upon the canvas. And this very discretion has persuaded even his own countrymen to underrate him. His last biographer, a painter and a Spaniard, denies him imagination, and finds his color at fault. But so fine a colorist was he, that by the simplest means he could produce an effect, which escapes forever those who are more lavish with their paint. And his was the true imagination, which works within the boundaries of its art. The religious commonplaces of Murillo were easier to find than the single pose, for instance, which perfectly suits the contour of a dwarf. Had Velasquez desired to amuse the common mind with fables, there were a thousand fables ready to his hand. But his imagination was too select for illustration, since like a true classic he spent his fancy rather in expression than in the choice of a subject. Yet how admirably, with how fine a sense of poetry he treated the subjects which he chose! For assuredly he was a classic in the sense that Virgil was a classic, and it is not extravagant to believe that he mixed in his veins some drops of Latin blood. Seneca and Lucan, true classics both, came from no further away than Cordova, and who knows but some remote ancestor of Velasquez was a citizen of Rome, and a willing slave to the great tradition, which passed from Athens even to the distant peninsula.

A single grievance remains to be answered. Velasquez, say his detractors, was a courtier, and the detractors do not speak the word in compliment. Yet surely it is an ignorance of history which persuades men to blame a painter for accepting the generous gift of independence. The hero who painted for his own amusement and to obey the King knew not the fear of degrading his art. He at least would never debase the august currency. If he owed loyalty to the King, he kept his conscience for himself,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and never stooped to flatter a vain and anxious purchaser. How much better was the ancient than the modern method! When Velasquez exhibited a picture, he set it alone in the Calle Mayor for all the world to admire; and he was rewarded with the pious verses of the poets. The painters of to-day must struggle like gentlemen in an ignoble crowd for a place upon a common wall, where the vulgar blaze of vivid color cries down their more modest refinement. No, it is the fiercest sin of democracy that it has rendered the real patron impossible. The collector, who has painfully heaped up his hoard of gold wants what he esteems full value for his money, and no doubt he gets it, but let him not flatter his pride that his is an encouragement of art. Truly the patron of old performed a noble duty. Philip IV., of course, had no hand in the making of Velasquez; but Velasquez would not have been precisely the master whom we know had not Philip opened the palace door.

Fortunate in his life from the moment he entered Madrid, fortunate in his work, which was only interrupted by the honorable fatigues of the Court, fortunate also in his temperament, which made him anxious for the success of others, Velasquez still wears his sovereignty like a flower. After three centuries he is serenely fresh in his majesty, and happy, even, in that he has left no school. Who, indeed, shall copy perfection or mimic the achievement of pure artistry? A glance at the modern painters of Spain, whose skill is incontestable, and who possess all the virtues save restraint, proves how easily he guards his Kingship. And the tribute paid him at this tercentenary is as simple as he could have wished it. No new pictures are added to the collection. Only the masterpieces, which have long been the glory of Madrid, are gathered into one room, simply arranged and quietly decorated. There for the first time the art of Velasquez tells its continuous story, and there doubtless will pass thousands of pilgrims in respectful admiration. Above all Madrid has proved that she knows how to pay an appropriate tribute to one who was not only the greatest of her painters, but a distinguished courtier and a noble Knight of the Order of Santiago. And the world which looks on may reflect that, in thus honoring her heroes and country, she confers the highest honor upon herself.

CHARLES WHIBLEY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE WAR WITH SPAIN—III.

BY MAJOR-GENERAL NELSON A. MILES, COMMANDING THE UNITED STATES ARMY.

THE success of Captain Dorst's expedition, in which he supplied Garcia's Cuban troops with 7,500 rifles, a million cartridges and a large amount of war material, had contributed its part toward the general results. So did the hazardous journey made by Lieutenant Rowan, U. S. Army, who landed at El Portillo, about 70 miles west of Santiago de Cuba, on April 24th, visited General Garcia's camps, crossed the island to Manati on the north coast, and sailed thence on May 4th in an open boat to Nassau, New Providence. He had succeeded in gaining full knowledge of the condition of affairs existing prior to the campaign at Santiago.

At about the same time an important reconnoissance was made by Lieutenant Whitney, U. S. Army, through Puerto Rico. He left the United States on May 5th and reached St. Thomas. There he shipped as a common sailor on board a British tramp steamer, and after many adventures and vicissitudes got himself put ashore on the island of Puerto Rico. His risk was as great as an officer could take, for, being in disguise, under an assumed name, in the midst of the enemy, without other protection than his wits, the penalty of capture would have been nothing short of a spy's death. He visited Ponce and other places, explored the southern portion of the island, and left there June 1st, returning to Washington June 9th, in time to accompany me to Santiago and Puerto Rico. The information he gained concerning the position of the Spanish troops, the topography of the country, the character of the inhabitants, the resources and amount of supplies available, and especially his reports of the condition of the harbors, I afterward found to be most important.

Before the command under General Shafter started from

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Tampa for Santiago, the general plan of campaign was to effect either the capture or destruction of the Spanish fleet under Cervera, and then make an attempt to capture the island of Puerto Rico. The island was considered the key to the possession of the West India Islands, and therefore of very great strategical importance. With that end in view I was, on the 26th of June, directed to organize a second expedition to campaign "in Cuba and Puerto Rico;" but the resistance which our troops met with at Santiago and the call for an additional force at that point made it necessary to send forward portions of the command intended for the second expedition to reinforce the command at Santiago.

The destruction of the Spanish fleet and the capture of the garrison having been completed, the expedition to Puerto Rico became the next object of immediate importance. To return to Washington and organize a large expedition, or to assemble one on the north coast of the island of Cuba, in the Bay of Nipe, would require much time when time was extremely valuable, and, as I believed, of vital importance. As to taking any part of the command that had landed in the vicinity of Siboney and Santiago, very serious consideration was given, owing to the fact of the appearance of yellow fever. Reports were called for from all of the regiments that were then in Cuba. These were carefully examined each day to ascertain if any of the regiments were free from infection, and it was found that there was not a single regiment that had not been represented on the surgeons' reports as having some cases of this dread disease, ranging from the lowest number to as high as 33 cases to a regiment. There had been nearly 500 cases of yellow fever reported by the surgeons. In addition to these, there were many reports of sickness, great weakness and prostration among the troops, which I then supposed were caused by exposure and climatic influences, and I did not suspect them to have been augmented, as I believe now, by other causes. It was therefore considered injudicious to take any portion of that command, and it was necessary to make up the expedition for Puerto Rico entirely independently of the force (upwards of 17,000 troops) left on shore in Cuba. I was only able to gather 3,414 fighting men for that enterprise, and so reported by cable. This included those who had fallen sick since sailing from the States, the effective force being about 3,300 men.

This seemed hardly a sufficient force with which to invade an

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

island defended by about 20,000 troops. The available United States troops were still on board the transports and had not come into contact with the troops affected with the yellow fever. As soon as the necessary transportation could be arranged for, with proper supplies, and a convoy secured from the fleet, the command was to sail.

The expedition rendezvoused at Guantanamo harbor, some fifty miles east of Santiago, a well-sheltered harbor, which the navy had captured and utilized very much to their advantage.

After four days of most active preparation at Guantanamo, the expedition sailed on the afternoon of July 21st, under the escort of a convoy commanded by Captain (now Admiral) Higginson, of the battleship "Massachusetts."

Before sailing from Guantanamo I had expected to receive from the harbor of Santiago tugs, lighters and appliances for disembarking, and I had hoped to meet during the night, when traversing the Windward Passage, similar appliances for landing, but when day dawned this hope had been dispelled. The expedition turned eastward, moving slowly along the northern coasts af Haiti and San Domingo, pursuing almost the identical track followed by the Great Admiral on his first voyage of discovery as he prepared to return to Spain four centuries before.

On the evening of the 23d we passed in sight of the point of land on the northern coast where the first Spanish colony was planted by Columbus.

About three centuries ago a disaster had resulted to a British expedition against the Spaniards, worthy of mention at the present time. The expedition had originally been directed against the very point of Puerto Rico for which we had set sail. It was under the command of two of England's most famous naval heroes. The circumstance is related at some length by the historian Hume, but more briefly by Knight, who says: "Sir Francis Drake and Sir John Hawkins sailed with six of the Queen's ships, and twenty others fitted out at private charge, having on board a considerable land force, commanded by Sir Thomas Baskerville. They made an assault on Puerto Rico, but they were repulsed.

A century ago, after the Franco-Spanish alliance against England, the British prepared to weaken Spain through attacks on her colonies. A squadron was assembled in the West Indies under the command of Sir Ralph Abercrombie, which at-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tacked the Spanish fleet in the bay of Port of Spain, Island of Trinidad, and captured the island, with 200 pieces of artillery and all its stores. The English then turned their eyes toward Puerto Rico, as being the nearest Spanish island of importance. Abercrombie landed his troops off the little hamlet of Cangrejos and made several determined attempts to take San Juan; but after two weeks of desultory bombarding and skirmishing was finally forced to depart, with a total loss of 230 killed, wounded and missing.

On the 24th of July we passed off the Bay of Samana, whence Columbus, in January, 1493, took his departure for home. Had he sailed east, instead of northeast, on his return home, he would have found the large island of Puerto Rico, which at that time was known among the Indians as the Island of Carib.

The first clash of the coming contest was to be between the invaders and a dependency of Spain wherein Spain's authority had been maintained for three hundred and ninety years (since the island was captured and subjugated by Ponce de Leon), and was yet unquestioned.

Realizing the fact that our destination had undoubtedly become known to the enemy, the problem presented was one requiring most serious consideration. In fact, the following items appeared in the Washington papers and were doubtless cabled to Madrid and back to San Juan de Puerto Rico as soon as published in the press of the United States.

On July 22d this item was published : *"Miles on his way—Left with 3,000 men yesterday afternoon for Puerto Rico.*

"Secretary Alger believes that General Miles, on the 'Yale,' will arrive at his destination Sunday morning, with 3,000 men under his immediate command."

On the 23d it was announced that "General Miles is now east of Cape Haytien," etc., and on the morning of the 24th appeared the following:

"St. Thomas, July 23.

"The Spaniards at San Juan de Puerto Rico are making extensive preparations to resist an anticipated attack upon the part of the United States warships which are understood to be convoying the army of invasion commanded by General Miles. There were no signs this morning of the American warships or transports, but news of them is expected soon."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The point for disembarkation, Point Fajardo, for which we had set sail, had been originally selected at the instance of the officers of the Navy. This point was on the northeast corner of Puerto Rico, and presumably the Spanish commanders must have obtained information of our destination and our strength. Later it was learned that they had been apprised of both and had actually proceeded to concentrate their forces and commence constructing entrenchments and fortifications with a view to a stubborn and effective resistance. Acting on the principle that a military commander should do that which the enemy least expects him to do, I determined, under the circumstances, to change my point of disembarkation from the northeast coast of the island to Guanica, on the southwest coast, and within easy striking distance of Ponce, the principal city and commercial emporium of the island.

Instead of making a demonstration at Pt. Fajardo, it was finally decided to go direct to Guánica.

Of course, the tugs, the launches and other fleet steamers of the enemy in Puerto Rico must have been on picket duty well out from the northwest shores of the island, ready to give quick notice of the discovery of the skyward-curling smoke of the approaching squadron, which would be seen by them long before they themselves could be observed from the squadron, and hurry back to announce its approach by telegraph from Aguadilla or Arecibo, as the case might be. They might fairly have reported that the squadron standing well out to sea was sweeping eastward off to Mona Passage, which meant, of course, its probable appearance at Fajardo on the morrow. But later that squadron, having turned sharply south, was plowing the Mona Passage, its officers and men having had their first glimpse of the mountain peaks of Puerto Rico through the dim, misty light of the eastern horizon. Under cover of the darkness of night the fleet was quietly stealing down the broad passage, every light extinguished, and even the port holes on the port side closed, notwithstanding the intense heat and close atmosphere. In the gray shadowed light of the evening and night the fleet presented a picture unlike anything I had ever seen before.

One familiar with the western plains of a quarter of a century ago might well have been reminded of a pack of large gray wolves cautiously and noiselessly moving in the shades of night, or the dim light that ushers in the dawn, upon their prey.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What the morrow should bring none could foretell.

There was more anxiety than sleep during the weary hours of that night, and early the next morning we went on deck to witness the first appearance of the Caribbean sun. The picture at 5 o'clock was one never to be forgotten.

The squadron had some time before doubled the islands which stand out like sentinels at the southwestern extremity of the island, and was now trailing directly toward the east, with a magnificent land view sharply defined in the distance to our left.

Suddenly the "Massachusetts" is seen to turn abruptly to the left and lead directly toward the land, every ship in her wake turning exactly at the same place. There is much signalling among the warships, which the landsmen could not decipher, and an opening into the inland gradually emerged to the view out of the hazy distance. At length the "Massachusetts" heaves to, broadside on, in front of the opening, her brave men standing at quarters and her decks cleared for action. More signalling follows, and the "Gloucester" takes the lead, with the Stars and Stripes in extravagant proportions glistening in the morning sunlight from her mainmast, manœuvers for a brief time between the "Massachusetts" and the entrance, and then is seen to move slowly and cautiously forward, straight into the channel between the two bold headlands which mark the place of ingress to the harbor of Guánica, beyond one of which she soon disappears, her officers and men keeping a sharp lookout for masked batteries above and submarine mines below. Soon she sends back in the thunder of her guns the announcement that she is clearing the shores to make the landing of her small company of marines safe. She was immediately followed by the transports, and every available boat from them and from the naval vessels was freighted with eager and fearless troops. The navy rendered cordial and invaluable aid in disembarking troops and supplies. Ten lighters were captured at Guánica and a few days later seventy more at Ponce.

By 11 o'clock on the morning of the 25th a firm footing had been established and the American flag raised.

While at sea the organization of the various bodies into a Provisional Division had been effected. It consisted of two brigades, the first of which, composed of the 6th Massachusetts and 6th Illinois Volunteers, was placed under the command of Brigadier-General G. A. Garretson, and the second, composed principally of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

artillery, under the command of Major Lancaster, 4th Artillery; the immediate command of the whole being assigned to Brigadier-General Guy V. Henry.

On the evening of the 25th a company of the 6th Massachusetts, on outpost duty on the Yauco road, were made aware of the presence of the enemy, and General Garretson sent two additional companies to their support. About 2 o'clock on the morning of the 26th the enemy opened fire upon our advance, whereupon General Garretson proceeded at the head of five more companies of that regiment to their assistance, and on his arrival, when he discovered that the enemy were preparing to make a surprise and attack, he immediately assumed the aggressive and drove them from their position, compelling their hasty retreat on Yauco. Great credit is due General Garretson for his courage, skill and enterprise in winning the first fight on Puerto Rican soil. In fact, the first engagement is always of great importance, because of its moral effect upon the troops of both sides.

Two days later the town of Yauco was occupied by a detachment of General Garretson's brigade, giving us possession of the railroad and main highway, by which a direct march upon Ponce was feasible, although that place was occupied on the same day by troops moved by sea.

On the 27th Major-General Wilson and Brigadier-General Ernst arrived from Charleston with part of the brigade belonging to the command of the latter, the 2d and 3d Wisconsin Volunteers. On the same day the "Annapolis" and the "Wasp" joined Captain Higginson's squadron.

With the force at Yauco threatening from the rear, the command was now strong enough to move directly against Ponce from the sea. General Wilson was therefore directed to hold his command on board ship, move outside the harbor and anchor, in readiness to follow in the wake of the battleship "Massachusetts" when, during the night, she should steam for the harbor of Ponce.

Early on the morning of the 28th, just as General Wilson was entering the harbor of Ponce, the "Mobile" arrived, bringing the balance of Ernst's brigade, the 16th Pennsylvania Volunteers, and also two companies of the 6th Illinois, which had been left at Charleston for want of room on the "Yale" and "Columbia."

The "Dixie," the "Annapolis" and the "Wasp," all under command of Commodore Davis, had entered the harbor on the pre-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vious evening to reconnoitre, and found it was neither fortified nor mined. The garrison of La Playa had fled. The commander of the Spanish forces at Ponce had been censured and imprisoned for not making a strong defence, but it would have been fruitless if not disastrous for him to do so, as he would have been menaced both in front and rear by a superior force.

On the morning of the 28th, the army took possession of the city and its port, La Playa.

General Wilson, a very distinguished general of high rank and important command in the Civil War, was placed in immediate command of the city.

Soon after landing at Guánica an incident occurred which impressed me very forcibly. While I was supervising the operations on shore, a white-haired mulatto, who spoke a little English, pressed his way to the head of my horse and inquired if I was the commander. Being answered in the affirmative, he handed me a small packet, which he had carefully concealed, which proved to be a communication in Spanish. Translated, it read as follows:

"To the Chief of Operations of the Invading Army of the American Union:

"Citizen: Not knowing exactly how I ought to guide myself in entering into a direct communication with your camp, I direct this to the Chief of Operations, to express to you my duty in these historical moments, and that trust in the power of a strong conscience and in the valor of arms as they pertain to the great issues of liberty and of patriotism in this island. An absolute military censorship shuts out from the city the means of obtaining the news, and I wish that you and your companions may know the true feeling of our municipality. Here we wait with impatience American occupation that comes to break the chain that has been forged constantly during four centuries of infamous spoliation, of torpid despotism and shameful moral slavery. When the rudders of the American ships entered the waters of the coast of Guánica to bear to this country political revolution, great confidence was born again, again was awakened the ideal of sleeping patriotism in our consciences and the lullaby of perfidious promises which have never been fulfilled. An entire city, with the exception of those who live under the shadow of pretense and official immunity, is prepared to solemnize the glorious tramp of civilization, and offers its blood as a holocaust to such a grand proposition. Let this message bear to you notice that our municipal conscience does not sleep and wait. Here you can count on the great masses who are prepared to second your gigantic strength. All the districts of this jurisdiction are prepared for combat. The districts of the city are also prepared. Men of intrepid hearts surround me, ready for the struggle. The only thing that prevents the manifestation of unity is an absolute need of the elements of war. On the other hand, we have already driven from the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

town our eternal enemies to the rights of Puerto Ricans. I do not wish to impose upon my ideas of patriotism the grave responsibility of directing my men upon the enemy without capacity to maintain the struggle. In this moment of activity may this communication serve to dispose you to embrace an opportunity to utilize the services that I offer. Before closing, I wish to warn you that at the entrance to this city, on the roads of Adjuntas and Canas, the Spanish Government is actively engaged in constructing several trenches to foolishly obstruct the march of the army of liberty, and they are concealing themselves in the small neighboring hills and difficult passes in the cañons in order to carry out this resistance. With many wishes for your health and much appreciation of the great triumph of America, I am,

"Your humble servant,

"FELIX MATOS BERNIER."

"July 26, 1898. (Ponce, P. R.)"

To such a people it became my pleasure to issue a proclamation.

"Ponce, Puerto Rico, July 28, 1898.

"To the inhabitants of Puerto Rico:

"In the prosecution of the war against the Kingdom of Spain by the People of the United States, in the cause of Liberty, Justice and Humanity, its military forces have come to occupy the Island of Puerto Rico. They come bearing the banner of Freedom, inspired by a noble purpose to seek the enemies of our country and yours, and to destroy or capture all who are in armed resistance. They bring you the fostering arm of a nation of free people, whose greatest power is in its Justice and Humanity to all those living within its fold. Hence the first effect of this occupation will be the immediate release from your former political relations, and it is hoped a cheerful acceptance of the government of the United States.

"The chief object of the American military forces will be to overthrow the armed authority of Spain and to give to the people of your beautiful island the largest measure of liberty consistent with this military occupation. We have not come to make war upon the people of a country that for centuries have been oppressed, but, on the contrary, to bring you protection, not only to yourselves, but to your property, to promote your prosperity and bestow upon you the immunities and blessings of the liberal institutions of our government. It is not our purpose to interfere with any existing laws and customs that are wholesome and beneficial to your people so long as they conform to the rules of military administration of order and justice.

"This is not a war of devastation, but one to give to all within the control of its military and naval forces the advantages and blessings of enlightened civilization.

"NELSON A. MILES,

"Major General Commanding United States Army."

The sentiment spread like magic over the island. It caused a large number of volunteers to immediately desert the cause and colors of Spain.

Brigadier-General Schwan arrived from Tampa on the 31st

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with the 11th and 19th Infantry, a troop of the 2d Cavalry and two batteries of the 7th Artillery. Major-General Brooke arrived on the "St. Louis" July 31st, and was ordered to proceed the day following to Arroyo, about forty miles east of Ponce, where he landed on the 2d.

On the 1st of August Brigadier-General Peter C. Hains arrived on the "St. Paul" with the 4th Ohio Volunteers, and on the 2d the 4th Pennsylvania Volunteers arrived. Both these regiments were sent at once to join General Brooke.

As reinforcements continued to arrive they were assigned to the various columns, which it was desired to move with the least possible delay. It was known that the enemy, having been misled as to our supposed place of landing, had concentrated their forces nearly eighty miles from our point of occupation, and had subsequently decided to occupy and fortify a narrow pass in the mountains near Aibonito. This fact being known, it was our purpose to make strong demonstrations in front of that position, without the slightest idea, however, of sacrificing lives in a direct assault.

There was a trail over the mountains from Adjuntas to Utuado, a distance of some eighteen miles, but it was so rough that the Spaniards had considered it impracticable for the passage of troops, and had neither guarded nor fortified it. Brigadier-General Roy Stone, an officer of war experience and a skilled engineer, was directed to make it practicable. He was supplied with an adequate escort for his protection and given unlimited authority to employ native labor. He soon made the route practicable for the passage of General Garretson's command, which crossed over the mountains to the north side of the island.

On August 5th General Brooke had a sharp engagement with the Spanish troops at Guayama, which town was finally captured by our forces; and on August 8th another engagement took place as the result of a reconnoissance on the road north of Guayama. This reconnoissance developed the fact that the enemy was strongly entrenched on a crest commanding the road from six to eight miles north of Guayama, toward Cayey. One object of the movement under General Brooke was to intercept the enemy if he should fall back from Aibonito on the advance of General Wilson, and also to co-operate in the attack upon that place.

On August 6th General Schwan was ordered to proceed from Ponce to Yauco with six companies of the 11th Infantry, Troop

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A, 5th Cavalry, and two batteries of light artillery, and on arrival there to take the balance of the 11th Infantry (which was already there) and organize his command preparatory to a movement by way of Sabana Grande, San German, Mayaguez and Lares to Arecibo, to which point it was intended to send General Garretson's column by the more direct route *via* Adjuntas and Utuado—all to be concentrated under General Henry, together with additional troops to be sent around by sea from Ponce to Arecibo; and it was intended that when a junction had been formed the division should march on San Juan. Arrangements had also been made to send a gunboat to Arecibo to assist, if required, in the taking of that place. The movement of this division from Arecibo to San Juan would have made the enemy's position at Aibonito and Cayey untenable and intercepted his retreat.

General Wilson, having pushed his troops forward on the road to San Juan, occupied on the 7th a line across a narrow valley about seven and one-half miles beyond the village of Juana Diaz. The enemy had a force of about 2,000 troops at Aibonito, thirty-five miles from Ponce, with an advanced position at Coamo, where it was estimated there were some 400 men. This advanced position could not be taken directly without great loss. General Wilson therefore decided, on the evening of the 8th, to send the 16th Pennsylvania Volunteers, under Colonel Hulings, by mountain cross-trails, which were known to be exceedingly difficult, over the divide into the valley of the Coamo River, so as to reach the main road in rear of Coamo. On the morning of the 9th General Ernst, with the main body of his brigade, moved forward to the attack, the brunt of the action, however, falling on the 16th Pennsylvania. The result was as planned. The enemy were mostly intercepted in their retreat, with a loss on our side of only six men wounded, while the enemy's loss was five officers and eleven men killed and sixty-seven wounded, and five officers and 192 men captured.

The four columns in their respective positions were now ready for a simultaneous advance, their ultimate destination being the same—San Juan; and their movements will be described according to location from west to east, which brings us first to that of General Schwan.

His command started from Yauco on August 9th. An engage-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment took place on August 10th at Hormigueros with the entire garrison of Mayaguez (consisting of 1,362 men). The enemy was driven back and so badly defeated that he continued his retreat before our forces, evacuating Mayaguez, a city of 20,000 inhabitants, which place General Schwan entered at the head of his troops at 9.30 A. M. on the 11th. On the afternoon of the 11th General Schwan sent out detachments of cavalry on both the roads leading to Lares to get information of the enemy's movements, and learned that the enemy was proceeding slowly on the Las Marias road. He ordered Lieutenant-Colonel Burke of the 11th Infantry to take six companies of that regiment and one platoon each of cavalry and artillery and make a reconnoissance on the road toward Lares. Colonel Burke left Mayaguez at 10:30 A. M. on the 12th and arrived at the forks of the Las Marias and Maricao roads about sunset, where he bivouacked for the night. On the 13th he came up with a large force of Spaniards at the crossing of the Rio Prieto, near Las Marias, where a sharp engagement took place. On this reconnoissance seventeen Spaniards were killed, a large number wounded, and fifty-six prisoners taken. The victorious march of General Schwan's column, however, was arrested by the receipt, on the morning of the 14th, of orders to suspend hostilities. Lares was, in fact, evacuated by the Spaniards in anticipation of the advance of our troops.

From the 7th to the 15th of August General Schwan's troops marched ninety-two miles, occupied nine towns, made 162 regulars prisoners of war, captured and paroled 200 volunteers, captured much valuable material and practically cleared the western part of the island of the enemy.

On the 12th General Garretson's brigade had passed over the mountains and reached Utuado, and on the 13th General Henry had joined that part of his command at that point, when he received notice of the suspension of hostilities.

In his report General Henry states that Arecibo would have been occupied on the 14th. Had hostilities not been suspended at that particular time, the Spaniards retreating before Schwan's brigade would have been captured, as they were between two strong commands and escape was impossible.

By August 9th General Ernst's brigade, of Wilson's command, was encamped along the valley in advance of Coamo, with its outposts about five and one-half miles beyond that town.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

On August 10th and 11th General Wilson had careful reconnoissances made of the enemy's position at Aibonito, as a result of which it was considered to be practicable to again turn the enemy by his right, to be effected by moving the main body of his (General Wilson's) command to Barranquitas, and thence to Aibonito, *via* Honduras, or to Cayei, *via* Comerio and Cidra, or to Las Cruces, on the main highway to San Juan, as circumstances might determine, leaving sufficient troops to hold the line occupied by our outposts in front of Aibonito. General Wilson had directed General Ernst to be prepared to make this movement at daylight on the morning of the 13th. In the meantime, on the 12th, partly for the purpose of diverting the enemy's attention from this projected movement, and to develop the strength of the Spanish batteries on the summit of Asomante Hill and El Penon, two and one-half miles northwest of Aibonito, a sharp artillery fire was opened on the enemy's position. Our artillery opened fire at 1 P. M. from a position on the reverse side of the low ridge to the left of the main road. When the turning movement was about to be made, General Wilson received the intelligence of the suspension of operations againt the enemy.

By August 12th General Brooke had made complete preparations to move Hains' brigade against the Spanish position on the road between Guayama and Cayei, which was to be done on the following day. Early in the morning of that day (13th) General Hains proceeded with one regiment (the 4th Ohio) down the Ponce road, thence northward, with the view of turning the position of the Spanish force near Pablo Vasquez, on the main road to Cayei. He was to move to the rear of the Spanish forces, while General Brooke, with the 3d Illinois regiment, a part of the 4th Pennsylvania, some batteries and other troops, would engage them on the main road. General Brooke placed his troops in the desired position and waited until he thought General Hains was at or near the position he was to take, when the artillery was unmasked and everything was ready to shell the enemy. Just at this moment, however, General Brooke received the message announcing the suspension of military operations.

Such, briefly outlined, was the campaign that gave us Puerto Rico, where the flag has ever since floated, farther east than ever before.

NELSON A. MILES.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

GOLF FROM A ST. ANDREWS POINT OF VIEW.

BY ANDREW LANG.

Golf has reached America, whether to "stay" or not. It appears to have arisen in "fashionable circles," and to have spread as I wish cricket could spread—a much better game. With us, in Scotland, golf is a very old sport, which Parliament tried vainly to put down, in the fifteenth century. Golf took up time which should have been given to learning how to hit an Englishman with a bow and arrow. But *that* game our ancestors declined to learn, thinking mere "long bowls" unmanly. Our Scots archers each carried a "sperthe" or battle axe, and, throwing down their bows, they went for the English with the cold steel, being shot as they advanced. Archery did not please, in Scotland; to golf we remained loyal.

Now, I have, personally, little doubt that we got golf from Holland, where it is no longer played. From Holland, to be sure, about Froissart's time (say 1380), we got everything we wanted, ready-made, paying in wool, fish, leather and other exports. My friend, Mr. James Cunningham, lately invaded Holland, in search of the Origins of Golf. I hope he will give his results to the world. We know that the Netherlanders played, for pictures of men driving off, and putting at the hole, occur in a MS. of about 1500, in the British Museum. Mr. Cunningham found pictures in which clubs and balls like ours occur, also painted tiles, of about 1650, but we knew already that these things were so. His chief discovery was the Dutch origin of such technical terms of the game as "putt," "stymie," and "dormie." If his philology is correct, as I believe, the question is settled. Holland is the cradle of the game. Scotland dealt very largely with Holland, and had regular trading settlements there, all through the later

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Middle Ages. The Scots merchants would take up the Dutch game, as we took tennis from France. In tennis, the technical terms are French (*dedans*, etc.); in golf, if Mr. Cunningham is right, they are Dutch. Our James IV., to encourage home industries, forbade the importation of Dutch golf balls, and, since then, golf has waned, and finally expired, in Holland, while it flourishes with us.

Golf is one of a group of accidentally differentiated sports. *Chole* (a word of Teutonic origin) is the Belgian golf, which has an element of hockey, the adversary being allowed one back stroke to the players' three strokes. There is no putting at the hole, the goal is a distant church door or steeple. M. Zola has described the game, in "*Germinal*," with his usual romantic exaggeration; and a match with the Devil occurs in the late M. Deulin's "*Contes*," from Flemish sources.

Again, the *Jeu de Mail*, at least as old as Queen Mary Stuart's time, when she was a player, is of the same group. A box-wood ball was driven with a club shaped like a light croquet mallet, and, in place of putting, the ball was "lofted" through a ring or into a narrow hoop. To this purpose a curious instrument, ending in a long piece of fluted steel (given in a portrait of about 1650), was employed. The "swing," the style, and the rules are in wonderful harmony with those of golf, as may be read in Lanthier's little work, now very scarce (1717-1720). My friend, Mr. H. S. C. Everard, the well known golfer and writer on golf, has a copy, which I first saw at a sale 20 years ago, but could not afford to buy; and no other copy have I ever seen. Mr. Everard might reprint it, with the excellent illustrations.

The historical glories of golf are well known. Mary Stuart played; her son, James VI. and I., brought golf to England, notably to Blackheath. His son, Henry, Prince of Wales, drove well, and not unsuccessfully tried to "cut over" his tutor. Charles I. insisted on playing out his game, at Leith, when news arrived of the Irish Rebellion. So writes Wodrow, the correspondent of Cotton Mather, and no friend of the Stuarts. The Great Rebellion ruined the Royal and Ancient Game in England, and, at the happy Restoration, the Duke of York (James VII. and II.), took up *jeu de mail*, astonishing Mr. Pepys by his drives in the Mall. Not being loved in England, where he was persecuted for his religious opinions, the Duke went to Scotland. There, even the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Covenant had not interfered with golf; the solitary uninjured institution. That savory Christian, Mr. Blair, of St. Andrews, an exemplary Covenanter, decorated his sermons (or his talk) with allusions to the favorite pastime. He compared the union of the Kirk and its sacred Head, to that of the shaft and head of a driving club. Faith was the whipping, Love the glue. So writes the later Presbyterian champion, Wodrow. In Scotland, the Duke of York played in a semi-professional foursome, at least his partner was a semi-professional. They won, and the tradesman, building or buying a house with the stakes, put up for his bearings two clubs, with the motto, "Sure and Far."

When his ideas of general toleration in religion (ably supported, as they were, by William Penn) caused King James to be driven from his throne, in 1688, golf vanished from England. Though a Hollander, the Dutch Usurper was not fond of his native pastime. James himself had lost his nerve (perhaps in consequence of his shipwreck, quite a fresh idea), and, notoriously, was no longer capable of playing a losing game. The House of Hanover have never excelled in any ball game; besides, cricket, in the enghteenth century, had made her supremacy secure. It was a cricket ball, I believe, not a golf ball, that killed Frederick, eldest son of George II., who, in his heart, was a Jacobite, like all his descendants, in sympathy.

While golf, in England, fled with the Stuarts, it survived with vigor in Scotland. "I believe there were only two honest men in Scotland, Forbes of Culloden and Locheil," remarked to me the descendant of one of the pair. Forbes of Culloden, who practically put down the Rising of 1745, was one of the first golfers of his day. In Scotland, Prince Charlie had little time for golf, but, before 1745, he had introduced the game into Italy, and played in the Borghese Gardens. This showed that his heart was in the right place. He was a great innovator. Golf he brought to Italy; Free Masonry to Arras, where Robespierre's father was a member of the lodge; and Glove Fights to Avignon. Golf is now established in and near Rome, and the learned archæologist, Signor Lanciani, is a golfer. With the purpose of improving his style, he means to take lessons, at St. Andrews, from old Tom, or Auchterlonie, in winter (I cannot wish him better or more courteous and agreeable instructors), and, incidentally, he will deliver the St. Andrews Gifford Lectures on Natural Religion. If he could

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

introduce a lecture on the old Roman game of *Cambuca*, and its relations to golf, I dare say Tom Morris would attend the lectures. As a rule, Tom is content with revealed religion, and gives the lectures a wide berth. I do not condemn this conduct in a man who has played golf for some seventy years, and yet, whose natural bent (as displayed in his attitude towards the Abolition of Stymie) is favorable to new or even revolutionary ideas.

About 1750-1760, golf was played near London by Dr. Carlyle, to instruct Garrick. I regret that Dr. Johnson was not present. Moreover, the Knuckle-Bone Club, at Blackheath, kept the game alive, in its earliest and Royal English seat. Meanwhile, in Scotland, from Orkney to Skye and from Skye to Musselburgh, golf flourished; chiefly, I believe, on sea-side links. About 1790, the Medal was won at St. Andrews with a score of 95. Recently, the round has been done in 72 (and, I think, in 71) by Mr. Freddy Tait, Auchterlonie, and, I believe, Andrew Kirkaldy. But, in 1790, the links were a very narrow course, beset by whins; there was only one set of holes, in and out, feather balls were in use, and there were no bulgers, no patent lofters, while the putting greens were not bowling greens. You cannot think how much wider and easier the links are, even since I was a boy. Thus a score of 95 in 1790, or thereabouts, is quite equal to one of 72 nowadays.

The great golfers of the early and middle century, Alan Robertson, Tom Morris (still on the spot), the Parks, with the contemporary amateurs, were the straightest of drivers, and *their* putting was indeed "an inspiration." They did not "approach" with irons or iron lofters, but with the elegant and harmless wooden "baffey spoon."* They did not cut up the links like modern men, making a point of "cutting their divot," or scrap of turf. I make no doubt that (considering the relative proportion of numbers) the ancestral golfers were as good as Varney, Taylor or Mr. Tait.

The middle century saw the superseding of feather balls at half a crown (Old Tom has made thousands in his day), by gutta percha shilling balls, hammered into tiny knobs, like the box-wood balls in the *jeu de mail*. The original smooth-bore gutta percha balls did not fly straight; hence the manner of *jeu de mail* balls was, quite unconsciously, imitated. About the same time, much lighter iron clubs were introduced (our ancestors tooled with

* "Baffed" means laid back, and I have heard a lady's bonnet criticised as "too much baffed."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

things like tomahawks of unusual weight); "brasseys" came in; finally Mr. Lamb invented the bulger. Short-headed, deep, and thick, this club is the reverse of the long-headed, slim, narrow club-head of Phelp or Alan Robertson. I doubt if it matters which sort you employ, whether you play as well as Mr. Leslie-Balfour-Melville, or as badly as the present outcast.

In the sixties, golf began to appear at Wimbledon Common, Westward Hoe, Hoylake, and at Pau in the Pyrenean country. Then arose Mr. Horace Hutchinson, from Westward Hoe school, as I am told. The wit and wisdom of Mr. Horace Hutchinson, in his "*Hints on Golf*," led to the Conversion of England. There had been earlier preachers,— the Stuart kings, Dr. Carlyle, the Knuckle-Bone Club, while the Scots, at Calcutta and Bombay, did not cast their grain on soil entirely stony. But these missionaries answer to Paulinus and Augustine: thorns sprang up and choked the doctrine. Mr. Hutchinson, on the other hand, came like Aidan (though not from Iona), and definitely converted England to golf.

Heresies, of course, began to abound. *The English count their strokes!* Every incompetent foozler has his pencil and paper and delays golfers by pausing to register his tens or thirteens. Also, he wrangles over invisible points in the rules. The Scot plays in the ancestral spirit of the game. On the links he drops metaphysics (which, indeed, are now scorned in Scotland at large). But the English revel in subtleties of interpretation, just as Cambridge men (to their defeat and confusion) bowl wides on purpose, because "there is nothing against it in the rules." Also the neo-golfers of England started "pot-hunting," endless competition for prizes, with monstrous handicaps. They brought in women. Here I am not wholly guiltless. The day before I and a reading party left St. Andrews, about 1873, we played the first foursome with ladies recorded since Queen Mary and Lord Lindsay played Mary Seaton and Maitland of Lethington; against which Knox (probably) thundered from the pulpit. Next morning early, I fled into the wilds of Atholl, with a price on my head; while my male opponent (English) put Tweed between himself and mischief. We only retreated just in time; our partners were left to the female tongues of St. Andrews. I was much the oldest of this nefarious foursome, and ought to have known better; anyway, my side lost, and I had to pay the stakes.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The female form and drapery, in driving, are not lovely objects, and ladies now beset the links. However, 'tis funny to see them *run* after their balls, with feminine impetuosity, and I will say that they choose hours when men are not playing, and, generally, efface themselves as much as possible; while I have seen a lady make quite a decent shot from the tee. These compliments refer exclusively to St. Andrews, and to St. Andrews in winter. I do not, for my part, regard women as nearly so objectionable as small school boys. My friend, Mr. ——, offered half a sovereign for the head of a small golfing school-boy. The reward (like the thirty thousand pounds for Prince Charlie) was unclaimed, but the proclamation had some effect.

It was the English, chiefly, who brought in fair (I mean female, for as to "fair"!) golfers, and they also set to work at the making of inland links. An Englishman would play across a turnip field. On one suburban course, the chief hazards are advertisement boards recommending pills and soaps! It is near a lunatic asylum, and, of course, the players *may* be patients. You read, in the press, "Brown's tee shot was caught in Cockle's Pills, but Smith was not more fortunate, coming to grief in Pears' Soap." This is not golf; I doubt if any inland imitation of the game is golf. I admit the existence of an artificial bunker at Wimbledon; it is a "melancholy pleasure" to get into it (as Mr. Hutchinson says with a touch of poetry), but one bunker, and that obtrusively artificial, does not make a course. By the way, if America wants *sand* for bunkers, let it apply to St. Andrews, where the very air is sandy, and sand gets into our very books. The exports of this emporium are solely potatoes; but if you need artificial bunkers, our supply of the article is unlimited in quantity, and unequalled in quality. Probably, however, the tariff on sand is prohibitive. "Tak' mair sand," says the sage, even Thomas, the Tomoris. If you want it, you now know where to get it; our houses, without exception, are founded on the sand. No extra charge will be made for skeletons, mediæval or prehistoric, with which our soil abounds. You may be filling up a bunker with the dust of King Constantine (about 940, A. D.), or of Cardinal Beaton.

Thus freely (like Montaigne concerning cats), I have spoken of the heresies of British converts to golf. But honesty compels me to add that the English professionals, as Taylor and Varney, are more or less our masters, while Mr. Ball's career is only

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

matched by our Mr. Tait's; who, in turn, can commonly defeat Mr. Hilton, of late. But, among amateurs, nobody is steadier, or better to back, than Mr. Leslie-Balfour-Melville, who is also not a man to try with loose bowling at cricket. He is *not* Mr. A. J. Balfour, M. P., to whom he could give no short odds. You may be a statesman, and a philosopher, like Mr. A. J. Balfour, "but gowf needs a heid."

Of American players I cannot speak, for I have seen none of them. May we soon find them on pilgrimage to St. Andrews, Sandwich, Prestwick and Hoylake. And, if there are to be international matches, may our excitable populace behave better than they have occasionally done, when local patriotism was fiercely aroused. Possibly, you also have an excitable populace? Why the rabble are so apt to forget the rules of fair play is a question which Swift should have argued in his "Modest Apology for the Rabble in all Ages." I have seen a Surrey crowd behave very ill when the Australians played at Lord's (to be sure they were irritated by bad accommodation), but, as a rule, an Australian victory in England, or an English victory in Australia, is cheered with the utmost chivalry. International matches, of all kinds, ought to be conducted in this honorable spirit by the spectators. As for the players, from them we need not expect anything but the most immaculate honor. There is no pleasure in a game played on other terms. If the learned, in their controversies, would only be sportsmanlike, the Republic of Letters would enjoy repose. Recommending to American golfers the old Scottish saw,

"Never in,
Never win,"

I rest from this brief but earnest survey of the Royal (and now Republican) Game.

ANDREW LANG.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED